

But all of this is beginning to change, particularly in Maryland. Reapportionment has revitalized the Maryland legislature and allowed it to come to grips with vital statewide issues.

The record of the last session of the General Assembly has been widely acclaimed. Perhaps its most important action was to enact the enabling legislation necessary to convene this Constitutional Convention.

These signs of life in Annapolis are gaining public attention and raising the prospect of truly effective state government in Maryland. More and more competent and civic-minded citizens are being struck with the idea of seeking public office in the state legislature. Yet for most of them the decision to run is a difficult one, in light of the present financial sacrifices required.

Because legislative salaries are so low, the prospect of state legislative office means severe financial sacrifice to the conscientious person not blessed with independent wealth. Many potentially excellent state legislators—family men without private means—simply cannot afford to seek and hold legislative office. Others will inevitably decide that they cannot afford to lose time from active and promising private careers for public office offering meager compensation. Our state cannot afford to lose the legislative services of these citizens.

We must realize that legislating for Maryland's welfare is no longer a part-time job and we must pay our legislators enough so that they can devote substantially all of their energies to public duties. We must compensate our legislators commensurate with the great and growing importance of their office. And we must begin to measure legislative compensation against the amount a Senator or Delegate would expect from the same time spent at his private occupation. In 1964, attorneys nationally averaged almost \$14,500 a year. Even if we were only willing to compensate a legislator as well as the "average" attorney, Maryland would have to more than triple the compensation of legislators.

This Convention must take the action necessary to give hope of increased compensation for our legislators. The draft constitution takes a great step forward by removing the constitutional freeze on legislative salaries. But I do not think this is enough particularly in view of the popular rejection in 1966 of a constitutional amendment to the same effect. I believe the risk of the draft proposal is not that our legislators will give themselves too great a salary but rather that the salaries they enact will continue to be too small. An astute legislator will remember that in 1962 the Maryland electorate rejected a constitutional amendment to raise the legislative salary by \$600 to \$3,000 a year.

By leaving to the General Assembly the job of deciding legislative salaries, we ask each legislator to evaluate his own worth to the state—a task we do not ask of our governor, our state judges, or, indeed, any state official other than the legislator.

I do not believe we should ask any man in public life to set his own salary. I do not believe that we can leave the General Assembly with the sole responsibility for setting legislative salaries. Therefore, I propose a device which will relieve the legislator of the onus of determining what he is worth.

I propose that the new constitution establish a Commission which would meet every two years in order to review and set compensation the state provides its legislators and, indeed, all statewide elected officials. I would have the Commission selected from private life by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. I would suggest that the Commission have approximately fifteen members and I would hope that they would represent a broad spectrum of the community.

I believe that this Commission should forward its recommendations on legislative and other compensation to the General Assembly. These recommendations could be raised or lowered by the General Assembly but only by two-thirds vote of each House.

In setting legislative salaries, I suggest

that the Commission be guided by the following general criteria:

(1) That legislative compensation should be set at a level which would attract the best qualified citizens to public service; and

(2) That legislative compensation should be competitive with what legislators could expect to receive for work of comparable importance and responsibility in private life.

The notion of a citizen's commission to study the adequacy of legislative and executive pay is not unknown to Maryland's sister states. Such commissions exist now or have finished their ad hoc work in Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah and Washington. While each of these commissions was created by executive order or legislation, I believe we in Maryland now have the opportunity at this Convention to create a viable continuing body to constantly reappraise the salary levels of legislators and state-wide elected officials to assure they are in line with rising living costs and growing legislative responsibilities.

Such a commission would not be without precedent in Maryland. The State Employees Standard Salary Board (Maryland Code, Art. 64A, §§26-30) was first created in 1941, although it was reorganized in 1953 and again in 1956. The Board prepares and recommends to the Governor a pay plan for all state employees to assure that comparable salaries are paid for comparable duties, experience, responsibility and authority. In establishing rates of pay the Board must give consideration to, among other things, prevailing rates for comparable public and private employment, living costs, and the State's financial condition. If the Governor accepts the plan, the plan has the force of law at the enactment of the next State budget if funds for the plan are provided in the budget as enacted.

I have offered but a basic framework of a Commission I consider a vital element of our Constitution. Such a Commission has ample precedent—both in Maryland and her sister states. I urge you to give it every consideration.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we are grateful for the unquenchable impulse for things high and holy which Thou hast planted within us. As in the heat and burden of this epochal day we are called to serve the Nation and all struggling humanity, lead us for Thy name's sake to the abiding springs of fresh hope and confidence for a better tomorrow, a new faith in Thy goodness which faileth never, and in the unrealized possibilities of Thy erring children, in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth.

God the all-righteous one, man hath defied Thee, yet to eternity standeth Thy word.

We pray for fidelity not to shirk the issues of these momentous days. Where our deeds can help to make this a fairer world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our

prayers can hasten the coming of a cleansed social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, let us speak and act and pray.

We lift our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 20, 1967:

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1967:

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 23, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

# NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frank W. Lehan, of Glendale, Calif., to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 657 and 658.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

## PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 673), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to initiate allotments for savings deposits for members of the Armed Forces who have been captured or are missing in action.

### EXPLANATION

Public Law 89-538, which was enacted on August 14, 1966, established a new savings deposit program for members of our Armed Forces. The objectives of the new program were to provide an attractive savings program for our troops overseas and to lessen an adverse balance of payments by reducing ex-

penditures of members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas. The new law authorized the President to fix a rate of interest at not more than 10 percent per year. By Executive order, the President prescribed an interest rate of 10 percent annually compounded quarterly effective September 1, 1966.

The Missing Persons Act provides authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to continue to pay and allowances of a person captured or in a missing status as a result of active service. This act also grants broad authority for the secretaries to initiate, continue, discontinue, increase, decrease, suspend or resume payments of allotments from the pay and allowances of persons in a captured or missing status, but there is no authority for the head of the department to initiate an allotment for a person in a captured or missing status to participate in the savings deposit program. This bill would provide specific authority for the secretaries of the departments to initiate allotments for members of the Armed Forces in a captured or missing status to participate in the savings deposit program. The provisions of the bill are broad enough to permit the initiation of such allotments for members of the Armed Forces who enter a missing status after the effective date of the new savings deposit program.

### COST

It is impractical to estimate the cost of this bill but the Department of Defense informed the committee that the increased interest payments will not increase the budgetary requirements of the Department.

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 6, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$17,500,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 674), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill as amended is to increase from \$12 million to \$17,500,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure within the Ryukyu Islands for programs approved by the President.

### BACKGROUND

Since the end of World War II the United States has exercised full powers over the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. Before the war these islands were an integral part of Japan. Following Japanese surrender, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupation. Unlike Japan, where occupation was carried out under Allied authority, the occupation of the Ryukyus proceeded exclusively under American control. While control has been restored to local institutions to a large extent, the United States has overriding administrative authority and responsibility.

The treaty of peace with Japan that was ratified by the Senate on April 28, 1952, provided for an administrative separation of the Ryukyus from Japan and for the continued exercise of all powers over the Ryukyus by the United States. Under the terms of article 3 of the treaty, Japan agreed that it would concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place these islands, as well as certain others, under its trusteeship, with the United States as sole administering authority, and that pending such disposition " \* \* \* the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands \* \* \*."

In Executive Order No. 10713, dated June 5, 1957, the President assigned to the Secretary of Defense the responsibility for the exercise of U.S. powers, subject to the approval and direction of the President. This Executive order charged the Secretary of Defense with the "development of an effective and responsible Ryukyuan government, based on democratic principle and supported by a sound financial structure" and with making "every effort to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants."

In the budget of the United States for fiscal year 1961 the President stated:

" \* \* \* since a system of military bases and other installations pertinent to the defense of the Pacific area has been developed in these islands, which are of critical importance to the security of the free world, it is expected that the United States will be responsible for their administration for an indefinite period."

In a sense there are two governments in the Ryukyu Islands. One is the local government of the Ryukyans themselves. This is called the government of the Ryukyu Islands. The other government could be considered an extension of our own Government to the Ryukyu Islands. This is called the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyus.

### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-629 provided a legal basis for U.S. programs designed to promote the development of the Ryukyu Islands. Among other things, that law provided the following authorities:

"(1) All fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, assessments and any other revenues received by the government of the Ryukyu Islands are covered into the treasury of the Ryukyu Islands and are available for expenditure by that government;

"(2) Revenues derived by the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from certain designated sources are deposited in separate funds and are available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with annual budget programs approved by the President of the United States; and

"(3) Not more than \$6 million was authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs approved by the President for purposes specifically set out in the law."

Public Law 89-629 did not substantially change the situation that then existed in the Ryukyus, but it gave legal sanction to a de facto condition. It did, however, provide specific statutory authorization for appropriations made previously on the basis of treaty authority.

Public Law 87-746 increased the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for aid to the Ryukyu Islands from \$6 million to \$12 million.

### CURRENT SITUATION AND COMMITTEE ACTION

Since 1962 the United States has been working toward a goal of raising the levels of public health, education, and welfare services in the Ryukyu Islands over a period of years to those obtaining in comparable areas of Japan. Such programs in the Ryukyus still lag behind those in Japan. But the com-



mittee understands this has always been true and there is evidence that the standard of living of the Ryukyus has been substantially increased during the period of U.S. administration.

In response to our request, the Government of Japan has increased its contribution to the economic development of the Ryukyus. It provided \$16.1 million in fiscal year 1967 and has budgeted \$25.8 million for fiscal year 1968. Although these amounts are larger than the direct U.S. participation in programs for public health, education, and welfare, the committee believes the U.S. contribution to the development of the Ryukyus cannot be accurately or fairly measured in terms of direct aid alone. The United States has provided other forms of assistance to the economy of the Ryukyus. In fiscal year 1956, for instance, U.S. expenditures entering the Ryukyuan economy totaled \$239.5 million, including \$20.6 million for the employment of 60,000 Ryukyuan, \$64.6 million in public and private loans and investments, and \$60.4 million in expenditures by U.S. personnel and our nonappropriated fund activities.

One of the reasons the committee considers it not inappropriate for Japan to make larger direct payments for public health, education, and welfare services in the Ryukyus Islands is that the existence of U.S. military power provides defense protection for Japan, as well as for the Ryukyus. Without these expenditures for defense by the United States the Government of Japan and the government of the Ryukyus would need to spend large sums for defense.

The executive branch proposed aid to the Ryukyu Islands in fiscal year 1968 of \$19.5 million, \$7.5 million more than the current authorization. Of the \$7.5 million of additional authorization, \$6.1 million was intended for education programs, \$1.2 million for public works, and \$0.2 million for economic development—\$5.6 of the \$6.1 million in educational programs was for the compensation of teachers. In reality, the United States would have discharged this much of teacher salary expense now being borne by the government of the Ryukyu Islands, thus making these funds of the government of the Ryukyu Islands available for other improvements.

Okinawa, the largest island of the Ryukyus, is our most important military base in the Far East and the United States has a large financial investment there. The committee recognizes the responsibility of the United States for contributing to the welfare of the people of the Ryukyu Islands. The committee also was mindful of the fiscal importance of reducing U.S. expenditures under circumstances now obtaining. Accordingly, the committee recommends a new authorization ceiling of \$17.5 million. Consequently, \$2 million of the proposed \$7.5 million in additional programs for fiscal year 1968 must be postponed. Identification of the programs to be reduced or postponed depends upon a reevaluation of relative priorities.

#### COST

If appropriations are made in full against the new authorization, enactment of this measure would result in additional annual costs of \$5.5 million.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the number of permanent professors at the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies (with an accom-

panying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., expressing the urgency of legislation to carry on the necessary expenditures of that Office (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

#### PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

[State of Illinois, 75th General Assembly]

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 178

Whereas, the rescue of Lake Michigan from death through pollution being caused by the oil and industrial waste being dumped into it is the number one problem facing the people of Illinois, and of Chicagoland particularly, today; and

Whereas, the State of Illinois, although it has the greatest stake in preserving Lake Michigan as a viable lake, is not the principal source of the pollution being dumped into it and is barred by the territorial jurisdiction of other states and the power of our federal government over navigable waters from effectively controlling most of the sources of this pollution; and

Whereas, both bodies of this 75th General Assembly have jointly and severally urged Congress to enact legislation designed to save Lake Michigan as a viable lake and a priceless asset of all the people whose life and livelihood are dependent upon its usefulness; and

Whereas, Senator Dirksen and Senator Percy, our two senators from Illinois have responded to this pending disaster being inflicted on the people of Chicago and, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Michigan, by introducing in the Senate on September 25, 1967, Senate Bill 2457, which makes it a dangerous offense to release oil in the Great Lakes; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, By the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we urge Congress to pass Senate Bill 2457 recently introduced therein by Senators Dirksen and Percy concerning the releasing of oil into Great Lakes waters, providing stiff penalties for violators and charging the Secretary of Interior with its enforcement; that we stress the emergency that we feel is involved as to the well being of the people of Illinois and others along Lake Michigan's shores; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is directed to transmit suitable copies of this preamble and resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all the members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the Senate, October 16, 1967.

W. R. ARRINGTON,

President pro tempore.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

Secretary of the Senate.

#### CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive O. 90th Congress, first session, the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization, transmitted to the Senate

today by the President of the United States, and that the Convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed for the use of the Senate, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Senate, for your advice and consent, the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization, done at Monaco on May 3, 1967, and signed for the United States on September 13, 1967. The general and financial regulations annexed to the convention are transmitted for your information.

The convention provides a treaty basis for the work of the International Hydrographic Bureau, an association of 41 maritime states founded in 1921 to make navigation easier and safer throughout the world. The United States has participated in the Bureau since 1922, pursuant to congressional authorization.

The primary task of the Bureau is to coordinate the activities of national hydrographic offices, promoting uniformity in their nautical charts and documents and encouraging adoption of reliable and efficient hydrographic surveying methods. It operates effectively in the field of hydrography but has been hampered in administrative matters through lack of recognized status. The convention would remedy this by establishing an international organization, with juridical status, within which the Bureau would continue to operate.

This scientific and technical association provides an opportunity for international cooperation in the hydrographic sciences and performs a valuable service to maritime navigation. The convention would facilitate and carry forward its important work. I recommend that you give the convention your early and favorable consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 24, 1967.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 676).

By Mr. PROXMIER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America (Rept. No. 678).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi (Rept. No. 681);

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion (Rept. No. 680); and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego (Rept. No. 679).

**RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 6167 TO FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 677)**

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report H.R. 6167, a bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and a new loan, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has requested me to have the bill referred to the Foreign Relations Committee in order that they might examine certain aspects of it. I have discussed the matter with him today over the phone.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report back to the Senate within 14 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED**

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable treatment for U.S. export trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2575. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under certain disaster conditions to purchase hay and other feed in order to provide for surviving livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 2576. A bill for the relief of Antoinetta D'Amico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2577. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

S. 2578. A bill for the relief of Yuen Hing, Wong Hing, and Wu Fuk Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 2579. A bill to amend the Enabling Act of the State of New Mexico with respect to miners' hospitals for disabled miners; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2580. A bill for the relief of Joaquin G. Serantes; and

S. 2581. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edmee Serantes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the poverty program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

**PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO LIBERALIZE SUBPART G OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE**

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, which would modify sections 970 and 971 of the Internal Revenue Code.

This legislation has been formulated as a result of the work of the Action Committee on Taxation and Exports of the National Export Expansion Council. This committee submitted its report in February 1966, and among its recommendations was the following:

The complicated and restrictive rules for obtaining tax benefits as an export trade corporation under Sections 970, 971 and 972 of the Internal Revenue Code should be simplified and liberalized. As a minimum step, the limitations on the profits excludable should be changed to one overall limitation of 10% of gross receipts each year. Furthermore, an export trade corporation should be allowed the benefits of these sections when selling to a related corporation in a foreign country provided that the related corporation resells the U.S. goods to an unrelated trade customer.

The chairman of the committee, Carl A. Gerstacker, has suggested to me that it would be useful to cast this recommendation in legislative language for the purpose of encouraging further discussion of the possibilities which such legislation may have for increasing U.S. exports and improving the Nation's balance of payments.

Generally, this bill proposes to liberalize the restrictions imposed by subpart G to the code in 1962, relating to "export trade corporation" and "export trade income." A reading of subpart G suggests that these provisions may be somewhat complex and limiting.

The specific operation of the proposed legislation is explained in a section-by-section analysis which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2574) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable treatment for United States export trade, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

**SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS**

The sections affected by introduction of the proposed legislation—970-972—make up Subpart G of the Internal Revenue Code and originated as a part of the Revenue Act of 1962 (26 U.S.C. 970-972; P.L. 834, 87th Cong.).

Generally, the 1962 Act subjects to current U.S. taxation the foreign income of "base companies," i.e. corporations which are affiliates of U.S. parent companies and are headquartered in one foreign country while selling to other foreign countries. The function of Subpart G is to reduce the Subpart F income subject to tax in the case of "export trade corporations" with "export trade income" as defined by these sections.

**SECTIONS OF THE BILL**

Section 1. The first section of the proposal would amend Sec. 970(a) (2) to eliminate the overall limitation prescribed by the subsec-

tion for all taxable years after January 1, 1967.

Section 2. This section would amend 970(b) to repeal the re-inclusion provision of the sub-section for all taxable years after January 1, 1967.

Section 3. This would make 1966 a permanent base year for the computation of decreases in investments in export trade assets dealt with by sub-section 970(c). The effect of the proposal would be that a decrease described by this Section would arise only if the investment falls below the 1966 figure. For example, if there were net increases in investments of \$5 million in 1967, and decreases of \$1 million in each of the next four years, there would be no Statutory decrease, because the net investment would remain above the 1966 figure.

Section 4. This would allow the foreign base company to resell to another related party or affiliated company, as long as the ultimate sale of the merchandise would be to an unrelated party for purposes of use and consumption. The application of this section would be to so-called "super distributing companies" which might be dealing with wholesalers in many countries.

Section 5. This section would amend sub-section 971(d), which now requires that "export promotion expenses" can only qualify for Subpart G exclusion if 90% of the expenses were incurred in the United States, and the 90% figure is met with respect to each of the four separate categories of expenses: salaries, rentals, depreciation, and other ordinary and necessary corporate expense. The proposal would apply the 90% test in an overall unitary manner.

Section 6. This section proposes an effective date, the tax year beginning January 1, 1967.

Mr. SMATHERS. In addition to the proposal contained in this bill, there were other recommendations in the Export Expansion Council's report, and there are still others which are receiving the active consideration of business groups and Government agencies. I hope that the measure introduced today will widen rather than narrow the alternatives which are presently being discussed.

In this connection, the Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has long recognized the importance of stimulating new exports by the more than 90 percent of the Nation's manufacturers and agricultural units which are small businesses.

It has been reported that there were 12,000 U.S. firms engaged in exporting in 1960 and, by 1966, this figure had risen to only 13,000.

Early this year the committee authorized a series of field hearings designed to interest all segments of American business in assessing the potentials and problems of building export industries in regional products over the next decade. The first of these sessions was held in the Pacific Northwest at Portland in May. The second is scheduled for November 10 and 11 in Mobile, for the Gulf, and the third on the St. Lawrence Seaway will take place in Milwaukee on December 1 and 2. The fourth in the series, for the North Atlantic, will be held sometime next year, and I hope that we will be able to hold the concluding hearings in my State of Florida.

On the latter occasion, I believe that we could examine the question of tax incentives for exports, and develop some balanced legislation which would have the effect of affording practical benefits to small exporters and proposed export-



ers, and would be consistent with our international obligations while at the same time satisfying the Treasury Department that any loss in revenues would be minimal.

In my opinion, legislation of this kind is needed in view of the prolonged balance-of-payments deficit and the recent shrinkage in our trade surplus. For the past year, 1966, the balance on the export-import account fell to \$3.7 billion, the lowest such surplus since 1959. This year, trade is looking only slightly better, at about \$4.5 billion—compared to a \$6.7 surplus in 1964—and the overall deficit appears to be worse. The Wall Street Journal of August 17 reports that the deficit for the first half of 1967 ran at a rate of \$2.1 billion, a substantially poorer showing than the \$1.4 billion the first 6 months of 1966. In an article in the Washington Post, columnist Joseph Slevin predicted this year's deficit "would match or exceed a 20-year high of \$3.9 billion that was reached in 1959 and 1960."

I have said on several occasions that tax incentive and other measures to increase exports were more positive and desirable methods of improving the balance of payments than the controls of capital which others seem to favor.

In the months to come, I am looking forward to having the Small Business Committee cooperate with the departments, agencies, and business groups concerned, in the interest of arriving at an export incentive measure upon which the Treasury Department, the Congress and the business and industrial communities can join forces.

It is my hope that the combined efforts of all who are working in this field will result in the establishment of a sound foundation for lasting progress in the Nation's export trade and balance of payments.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have referred be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for informational purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles presented by Mr. SMATHERS are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 1967]  
**PAYMENTS DEFICIT WIDENED FROM 1966 IN THE SECOND PERIOD—GAP AT SEASONALLY ADJUSTED \$513 MILLION WAS SLIGHTLY LESS THAN FIRST QUARTER'S—LOANS TO FOREIGNERS CLIMBED**

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit stayed nearly as deep in the second quarter as in the first and was much worse than in the like 1966 period, the Commerce Department said.

The overall deficit was a seasonally adjusted \$513 million, the report said, somewhat less than the \$536 million in the first period but considerably wider than the \$122 million of the second quarter last year.

Despite further fattening of U.S. gains on merchandise trade and some statistically beneficial transactions with other governments, the report showed that the total dollar outflow continued excessive mainly because of dealings for which details aren't yet available, including military, investment and tourist outlays. In addition, bank lending put more dollars into foreign hands for the first time in a year.

In the first half of this year, the deficit ran at an annual rate of almost \$2.1 billion, a

substantially poorer showing than the total of less than \$1.4 billion for all 1966.

The U.S. has a payments deficit when foreigners acquire more dollars than they return in all transactions. Those dollars ending up in the hands of foreign central banks and governments generally may be used to buy gold from the Treasury at the fixed price of \$35 an ounce.

The deficit total reported by the department doesn't clearly show the actual change in foreign dollar holdings, though, because it combines this sum with a change in U.S. reserves and because it adjusts the dollar changes to smooth out seasonal swings.

Without seasonal adjustment, the report showed, foreigners ended the second quarter holding \$614 million more than at the end of the first quarter. Dollars held by private foreigners rose by \$96 million, and those in foreign official accounts rose by \$518 million.

The reserves that the U.S. uses to cope with such deficits, however, increased by \$419 million in the quarter. The U.S. gold stock declined by \$15 million, but automatic ability to borrow foreign currencies from the International Monetary Fund rose by \$10 million, and the Government's ownership of foreign currencies rose by \$424 million.

The unadjusted trend was "probably a little worse" than in the first quarter, one analyst said, because of heavy purchases by foreign government accounts of certain securities with original maturities of a year or more. Dollars put into such securities, often bank certificates of deposit, cause a "statistical improvement," the report said, because they don't count as part of the deficit. However, they are roughly as real a threat to the U.S. gold stock as dollars kept in instruments of less than one-year maturity, officials believe.

In the second quarter, foreign official accounts acquired \$607 million of such deficit-shrinking securities, almost double the \$306 million of the first quarter. Investment in such securities can be viewed as an indication that other governments don't intend to cash in their dollars quickly for gold, officials say, but the large amounts involved make some officials wonder if the favorable dealings can continue for very long.

The basic favorable factor in the quarter, officials said, was that U.S. exports rose to a \$30.9 billion seasonally adjusted annual rate while imports slipped slightly to a \$26.3 billion rate, so that the surplus on merchandise trade alone mounted to a \$4.5 billion annual rate. The 1966 trade surplus totaled \$3.7 billion.

Farm products accounted for most of the U.S. export gain, the report said, with lackluster economic growth in many European countries and a decline in foreign-aid-financed shipments to Asia working against a broader gain. The relatively slack U.S. economy limited imports by reducing the need for industrial materials and by inducing many businesses to work down inventories, the report said. Also, the excess capacity in U.S. manufacturing let domestic companies supply more of the nation's needs, it added.

While banks remained well within the guidelines set by the Federal Reserve Board to limit their loan outflows to foreigners, the report said that the adjusted net outflow from their transactions was about \$170 million. This was the first increase in bank credit to foreigners since the like quarter of 1966 and "probably reflected the easing of money market conditions here," the department stated.

Altogether, capital movements for which data are available were slightly on the favorable side in the second quarter after a net outflow in the first, the department said. U.S. investors on balance sold off existing foreign securities, and their purchases of new foreign issues declined slightly despite a "considerable increase in purchases of Israeli bonds." Net sales to foreigners of private U.S. secu-

rities drew in some \$350 million from abroad after seasonal adjustment, compared with a little more than \$100 million in the first quarter.

In another development, Treasury Secretary Fowler said the U.S. dollar outflow through transactions subject to the interest-equalization tax was "very small" in the first half, but he stressed that the question of what tax rate to apply next is still open.

Under recently enacted legislation, the tax on Americans' purchases of foreign securities from foreigners was increased by 50%, with President Johnson empowered on Aug. 30 to keep it at its current level or set it at any lower rate. The tax currently adds 22.5% to the cost of foreign-stock purchases and 1.5 percentage points to the borrowing costs of foreign bond issuers.

Previously, officials indicated that the tax would be set in the upper end of the permissible range. But Mr. Fowler didn't give any hint of what will be decided.

The secretary stressed a recent narrowing of the gap between U.S. and European interest rates; this, other officials added, could let a relatively low tax rate serve as a sufficient deterrent. However, an opposite consideration, they added, is that they hope U.S. interest rates will be brought down soon by President Johnson's income-tax increase proposal.

Separately, the Internal Revenue Service said securities dealers considered "participating firms" and "participating custodians" under the interest-equalization tax law have more time to file their "transition inventory" statements. Companies that qualified before Aug. 15, the IRS said, are being given an extension to Aug. 28 from the previous deadline of Aug. 15.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
 Aug. 5, 1967]

#### BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT STILL RISING (By Joseph R. Slevin)

Gold and dollars are pouring out of the United States at a disturbingly rapid pace.

The critically important balance of payments deficit is going to be bigger this year than it was in 1966. Top officials glumly say that no substantial improvement is in sight.

Administration flash reports indicate that the gold and dollar outflow climbed to a \$2.2 billion a year rate in the first half of 1967. The total loss amounted to a markedly smaller \$1.4 billion last year.

Officials hope that the second half of this year will be somewhat better than the opening six months but they frankly admit that it could just as easily be worse.

The weakening of the U.S. payments position comes as a fresh setback to President Johnson's faltering campaign to balance this country's foreign accounts. The deficit now is surging above the \$2 billion mark for the eighth time in the past ten years and the President's goal of a surplus has been pushed further into the future.

Actually, this year's real deficit will be even bigger than the total that the Government will report. The Administration uses an assortment of gimmicks to dress up its payments accounts just as it uses them to make its budget deficits look smaller. Informed officials say the blunt truth is that the 1967 deficit would match or exceed a 20-year high of \$3.9 billion that was reached in 1959 and again in 1960 if it were not for the Administration's sleight-of-hand.

The U.S. chronically runs payments deficits because it lends, spends, and gives away more than it earns from overseas transactions. Foreign countries take payment partly in gold but mostly in dollars. They now have more than \$29 billion in claims that they theoretically could present for collection against the shrunken \$13 billion U.S. gold stock.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler stresses that Vietnam is a major cause of the worsening payments position. The U.S.

is spending some \$1.3 billion a year in Asia to buy oil, cement, steel, food, and other supplies that it needs for the war.

Vietnam costs are going up slightly less swiftly this year than in 1966 but they still are rising. Defense outlays in Europe and elsewhere contribute to the deficit. So do new business investments in foreign countries, foreign aid, and the increasingly heavy expenditures of American tourists.

The Administration now plans to carry out a full-scale review of the U.S. payments problem this fall.

European financial officials are not happy about the mounting flow of paper dollars that they have been taking in settlement of the U.S. deficits. The Administration will be under heavy pressure to adopt a tougher payments program unless the U.S. situation suddenly improves.

The proposals to be considered will include tourist spending curbs, foreign aid restrictions, controls on capital movements, and firmer limits on the foreign operations of American companies.

All have been discussed and rejected before. They are politically distasteful and they run counter to the freer trade principles that the U.S. advocates. But there is a growing conviction that the payments situation cannot be allowed to deteriorate further.

#### AMENDMENT TO FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1965—TO SAVE LIVESTOCK IN DISASTER AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under certain disaster conditions, to purchase hay and other feed to be provided for livestock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2575) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture under certain disaster conditions to purchase hay and other feed in order to provide for surviving livestock, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when the immediate fury of a sudden disaster has subsided, people in the disaster area begin the salvage job. The salvage job is always difficult, but in the case of farmers and ranchers, the process can be complicated. For example, a flood will scatter cattle; some will be stranded and some lost. A flood or a blizzard can make it impossible for the owner to get to cattle to feed them.

I had a personal experience in this respect when I was in south Texas during and immediately after Hurricane Beulah. I inquired about the cattle losses. The ranchers said:

We don't know. The cattle have floated down the river. We hear that some got out of the water and didn't drown.

Bodies of drowned cattle were found at various points, scattered by the floods. It will take time to round up the cattle and find out how many drowned and how many are alive.

Federal law currently allows the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, following a declaration of major disaster, to furnish Commodity Credit Corporation-owned feed grains free of charge. It goes to the appropriate State agency on a short-term basis for feeding livestock stranded, unidentified, or com-

mingled because of hurricane, flash flood, or other sudden disaster. Such feeding will continue until their owner can reassume responsibility for them. The CCC has no funds to buy hay or mixed feed, only grains.

Generally horses, sheep, or hogs can handle straight grain. Cattle need hay or mixed feed.

In order to furnish mixed feed or hay, the Secretary of Agriculture must negotiate a contract with the Office of Emergency Planning for funds with which to buy it—after the declaration of major disaster has been issued. By the time this negotiation has been accomplished, the cattle either have found feed for themselves, have starved, or they are weakened to such an extent that they die of disease. Many that do not die are in such bad shape that it might take up to 2 months to bring them back to predistaster condition.

The Secretary of Agriculture can feed people immediately without any of these time-consuming delays. He should have the same authority to feed cattle as he does to feed people in the case where a sudden emergency occurs—that is, without a declaration of major disaster, without any negotiation with the OEP.

Congress has been reluctant in the past to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make donations without a declaration of major disaster from the President. This is a wise policy whenever it can be utilized without unwarranted consequences. This policy is especially suited to a situation where the disaster builds up slowly, such as a drought. But where the disaster occurs suddenly such as a flood or blizzard, the delay occasioned by waiting for the disaster declaration can have ruinous consequences. Even when the request from the Governor is immediately forthcoming, delay is still a problem, since the Secretary cannot feed hay until he has negotiated a contract for funds with the OEP.

This livestock problem is common to all the hurricane-prone States on the Atlantic and the Gulf; the flood-prone States on the Pacific; and the middle and northwestern blizzard-prone states.

To remedy this situation, I propose this bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. This bill would amend title VII of section 709 by adding a new subsection. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use CCC funds to purchase hay and mixed feed and to make it available to livestock that are in need due to sudden disaster on a temporary basis. This hay and mixed feed would be furnished without charge to livestock that are stranded or whose ownership is unknown or uncertain because of such a disaster. The Secretary of Agriculture could purchase and feed this hay and other mixed feed without the necessity of a declaration of major disaster from the President and without negotiations with the OEP.

#### BIPARTISAN STUDY OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM: THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION ACT OF 1967

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint

resolution that would establish a bipartisan Economic Opportunity Commission to study the many aspects of the poverty program and determine the degree to which State and local public agencies participate in such programs and activities. The measure places particular emphasis upon the community action programs and the degree of cooperation between local public agencies and community action agencies and the policy and procedures to be followed to encourage local participation and cooperation. Another specific area of the study will be the proper role of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the executive departments of the Federal Government in the administration of antipoverty programs.

The Commission itself is to consist of 12 members, four appointed by the President from private life; four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and four by the Speaker of the House, two from the House, and two from private life. The appointments in each category are to be evenly divided between the majority and the minority parties.

Mr. President, the need for such a bipartisan study of this controversial program and I stress the bipartisanship of the Commission, is essential if we are to have the facts before us in order that the further activities of the poverty program may be judiciously considered. I have heard it often said in defense of the program that perhaps no other new concept in our Nation's history has been more studied and investigated. This is most probably true; however, in the main such studies have been conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. We need an objective inquiry into these activities to give us an unbiased account of this entire field of operation.

The need for such a study is quite clear; we are constantly hearing charges that the entire program is being carried out in a most inefficient manner; these charges are answered by claims that this is not so. The only thing that we in the Congress have been able to rely on thus far is the studies to which I have referred. Self-introspection on the part of poverty program officials will not suffice.

The results of this Commission's work, called for in my proposal, can only be beneficial to the Nation. If it is proven that the Office of Economic Opportunity and other agencies are now performing their functions well, then public confidence, which is badly shaken, can be restored. If on the other hand, it is found that the program is being run badly, as is feared by many, then we in the Congress could correct these inequities and help the program to achieve direction and real meaning for the Nation's poor.

Mr. President, I would hope the Senate would act swiftly on this matter. It is our duty to see that any money spent by this Government is money well spent and not merely used as a political tool. Confidence in our Federal programs must be maintained.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 118) to



establish a Commission to study the poverty program, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS JOINT RESOLUTION, 1968—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 420

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware proposed an amendment to the amendment of Mr. MUNDT (amendment No. 419) to House Joint Resolution 888, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 421

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House Joint Resolution 888, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. ALLOTT, which appears under a separate heading.)

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2419) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

#### CORRECTION OF COSPONSORSHIP OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 19, 1967, an error was made in a unanimous-consent request for the RECORD in which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2467. I ask unanimous consent that the consent be withdrawn and that, at its next printing, their names be added as cosponsors of S. 2463 to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain in-

dividuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WHY NOT HEED THE VIEWS AND ADVICE OF GENERALS BRADLEY, GAVIN, AND RIDGWAY?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Gen. Matthew Ridgway was one of the very great commanders of our Armed Forces in World War II. I am proud to say that I was a humble major in our Army overseas, and he was my commanding officer. Later, General Ridgway became commander of the United Nations forces in Korea following the dismissal of General MacArthur. Subsequently, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the Army. When holding hearings in August on our policy in Vietnam, did the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate invite him to appear as a witness? It did not.

General Ridgway is one of our most experienced and outstanding military leaders. It is noteworthy that his views regarding the involvement by President Johnson of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers in a ground war in Vietnam coincide with the expressed views of Gen. Omar Bradley, one of our greatest World War II field commanders and a former Chief of Staff, and of Gen. James Gavin, former Chief of Plans and Operations of the Army. General Gavin, of course, is one of the most brilliant strategic thinkers of our Army and is a former Ambassador to France. Surely, these great generals and their convictions that we are waging the wrong war in the wrong place and at the wrong time and that what we are doing in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam adds up to the gravest mistake that any U.S. President ever made should not and cannot be dismissed lightly. Their views certainly should be considered.

Would any sane man claim that Walt Rostow has had as much on-the-job training as Gen. Matthew Ridgway, for example? Could Dean Rusk wave off with stern disdain that his knowledge and his judgment are superior to the knowledge, judgment, and the sound experience of Generals Ridgway, Gavin, and Bradley? At that, this list of generals, who were heroes and great leaders in World War II and who are utterly opposed to our Vietnam involvement, could be considerably expanded, as numerous other experienced and knowledgeable retired generals and admirals

consider our Vietnam involvement a horrible blunder.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway months ago publicly endorsed retired Gen. James Gavin's advice that we should immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam, that we should stop that bombing without attaching any conditions, and then withdraw our Armed Forces to coastal enclaves such as Saigon and Cam Ranh Bay and other Guantanamo-like bases where our forces would have the cover of our airpower and the support of our 1st and 7th Fleets. These generals are deeply dismayed, and they are perplexed and dumbfounded over the military course the leaders of the executive department of our Government have been taking in Vietnam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. General Ridgway also responded immediately to criticism of the enclave tactic. He said we have been and are engaged in an enclave war in Vietnam. He said this would continue to be the situation until and unless this administration undertook a foolhardy invasion of North Vietnam by our ground forces. Unthinkable as that should seem to any sane-minded American, we hear more and more talk of the possibility of a land invasion of North Vietnam by our forces and by the friendly forces, so-called, of South Vietnam—although, I may say parenthetically, they are too friendly to fight even on their own soil in South Vietnam, where they do no fighting, let alone to fight in North Vietnam.

General Ridgway is the author of a book on the Korean war, recently published, and in that book he makes it crystal clear that he is dismayed by and opposed to our involvement in the Vietnam civil war. Furthermore, he is apprehensive at the sound of voices such as Dean Rusk's, or as he stated:

Influential voices assuring us that China would not dare make a move against us.

He expresses wonderment and doubt that our military planners could be lulled by faulty reading of the Communist Chinese mind.

It is evident he has an acute recollection that his then commanding officer in the Korean fighting, General MacArthur, ignored the intelligence furnished him by our Air Force that the Chinese had some hundreds of thousands of men of their armed forces on the northern bank of the Yalu and were about to invade North Korea. General MacArthur scornfully disregarded the Air Force intelligence and accepted the intelligence and confident assurances of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the Army that our troops could safely advance northward in North Korea to the Yalu, and that the Chinese would not cross the Yalu and attack.

General MacArthur was so deceived by the CIA and Army intelligence, he announced that the war in Korea had been won and the boys would be home by Christmas. The next day the Chinese attacked. MacArthur's two armies were caught in the strategically unsound position of having a mountain range cutting his forces in two. The forces of the United Nations were hurled back and we Americans suffered thousands of casualties in the terrible days and nights of fighting that followed.

General Ridgway recently called attention to the fact that although we Americans controlled the air over the entire Korean peninsula, General MacArthur acknowledged our inability to isolate the battle area by air bombardment and our inability to choke off the flow of reinforcements and supplies to the south from North Korea. General Ridgway stated in Vietnam results have repeated this lesson. Rails and bridges are repaired and functioning within a few days of a bomb attack. Infiltration routes have not been cut off. Yet, there is more and more clamor for saturation bombing of North Vietnam in an effort to cut off North Vietnam from the south. He says that effort is bound to fail.

Finally, it is evident to General Ridgway that President Johnson and Secretary Rusk are intent on total victory in Vietnam and not a diplomatic settlement. This means an all-out war. General Ridgway believes, and he states:

The ending of an all-out war in these times is beyond imagining . . . It may mean the turning back of civilization by several thousand years, with no one left capable of signalling the victory.

It is said that President Johnson, more than any other President, has a fine habit of telephoning to secure a consensus, or in other words, the benefit of the views and advice of those he calls. It seems strange indeed that apparently he has never telephoned General Ridgway. General Ridgway was asked this very question. He responded quietly, "No, I haven't been in Washington lately."

This question and answer were of more than a year and a half ago. Since that time a hundred thousand of the finest young men and the best trained and best equipped ever fielded by any nation for war have been killed or wounded in Vietnam. The hour is late, but it is not too late. I urge that our President seek the advice of Generals Ridgway, Bradley, and Gavin. It would be well, too, were the members of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to call these three generals into an executive or public session of the subcommittee to learn and benefit from their experience, expertise, training, and knowledge.

#### SIMCHATH TORAH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the nearness of Simchath Torah, the Jewish holiday, reminds of the great asset to all who love freedom that those of Jewish extraction and faith have been. One can point to their service and devotion in government at all levels. Their faith and practice of democratic

principles. Their understanding and leadership in science, medicine, and the arts. Their total commitment to freedom around the globe.

These qualities remain largely unused, frustrated, and unfulfilled in Communist lands, led by Russia.

Russia stubbornly refuses to let them leave but gives them little incentive to stay. Responsible positions in government are denied them. Synagogue doors are closing. Yiddish schools are no more. Jewish works are not published. Jewish spirits have been dimmed.

We are not talking about a handful of people. There are roughly 3 million persons of Jewish extraction in Russia.

Certainly their brothers throughout the world grieve for them. But they are not alone. The rest of us grieve too.

Our free world could use this talent, and this spirit and awaits the day when Russia either stops this oppression or lets those of Jewish extraction rejoin their fellow freemen.

#### FIRST AMERICAN FISH EXPOSITION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of going up to Boston this past week to participate in the First American Fish Exposition, sponsored by the Boston Globe. Mr. Davis Taylor, publisher of the Globe, was president of the exposition, and Boston attorney, Mr. Richard Sullivan, was executive director.

Unlike many boat shows and expositions I have attended over the years, this one was dedicated entirely to the commercial fishing industry and, in my judgment, it was an event of consequence and a tribute to the sponsors and those who participated.

I was particularly proud, Mr. President, of the number of firms from my own home State who felt that this gathering of the commercial fishing industry was important enough to travel themselves and bring their exhibits the great distance necessary to be present. To me it was important that our Pacific coast people—manufacturers, suppliers, and fishermen—were joining with those on the Atlantic to make the exposition a success.

On Friday evening a banquet was held and the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, made an address on the need for a program of rebirth for America's fishing industry, a subject and theme upon which I have often risen to discuss on the floor of the Senate. Senator KENNEDY's remarks were well received by those present and I am confident that he made a contribution toward unity within the fishing industry which is sorely needed.

Although we appeared on different days at this first exposition and had no contact as to subject, it was particularly interesting and significant to me that the themes we presented were unusually similar. It was with extreme regret that I was unable to attend the Friday banquet when Senator KENNEDY presented his program, but in studying his message I am pleased that we enjoy a dedication of common purpose toward

helping the fishing people and industry, which I refer to as "America's First."

Mr. President, I spoke of the need for unity, and before asking unanimous consent that his remarks be included in the RECORD at this point, may I emphasize his closing statement. Senator KENNEDY said—and the statement is a clear legacy to America's commercial fishermen, Atlantic, Pacific, gulf, or wherever—of the late President John F. Kennedy:

There must be a national voice, speaking clearly for the fishing industry. For only in this way will the industry's future be proud of its past.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY's speech be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTANA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The speech ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

#### A PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN FISHING INDUSTRY

(By Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY before the American Commercial Fishing Exposition, Boston, Mass., October 13, 1967)

In recent times—most strongly in the last twenty years—the tides of fortune have turned against the American fishing industry. Let me cite a few examples.

In 1948, U.S. fishermen caught about 4.5 billion pounds of fish, and in 1966 caught about 4.3 billion pounds. In 1948, this catch supplied 80 per cent of the fish eaten in this country; in 1966, it supplied only about 40 per cent. In the meantime, the U.S. has grown to become the world's foremost importer of fish and fish products, at an annual value of nearly \$750 million. These are not statistics of a growing industry—they are statistics of an industry lying dormant in the face of determined foreign competition.

A 1966 survey of the U.S. commercial fishing fleet showed that, of the nearly 14,000 documented vessels, the average age was twenty years, the average length less than 70 feet, 92 per cent had no refrigeration facilities, 84 per cent did not have hydraulic winches, 77 per cent did not have radio direction finders, and 48 per cent did not have radio-telephones. These are not statistics of a modern fleet—they are statistics of an obsolete, outmoded fleet whose owners are unable to finance the high costs of modernization.

The yearly per capita use of fish for the table in the United States is 10.5 pounds; for beef the per capita use is 104 pounds; for pork it is 58 pounds and for chicken 36 pounds. These are not statistics of an industry which aggressively markets its products—they are the statistics of an industry which lacks the power that organization brings.

In 1963 the Russians caught 50 million pounds of fish in waters off the coast of New England; in 1964 they caught 165 million pounds. In 1964, landings at the Boston Fish Pier totaled 106 million pounds; in 1966, they totaled only 89 million pounds. These statistics tell the story of one nation bent hard upon expanding its fishing industry, and of another nation letting it die.

These indicators of how far from its peak our domestic industry has fallen may be a cause of alarm. But they should not bring a feeling of hopelessness.

For there is hope. We have the knowledge. We have the means. We have the desire. We have the dedication.

What we need is a program and a determination to bring about the rebirth of the American commercial fishing industry.

This kind of rebirth is essential. It can



mean new jobs to fishermen and processors. It can mean new orders to shipyards and suppliers. It can mean the rebuilding of our port facilities. It can mean more and better food to the hungry people of the United States and all the world. It can mean added tax revenues for our hard-pressed municipalities.

And it can mean that the faded reputation of the American fishing industry can be restored—a reputation which dates from the time when the swift schooners of Gloucester marked the crest of world fishing ability and knowledge.

A program to bring about the rebirth of the American Commercial fishing industry must focus on each link of the chain sustaining the industry—the fish, the fishermen, the processors and the marketers. Each link is necessary to a sound industry and overlooking any of the four can be fatal to our success.

I propose a 10-point program for the rebirth of the industry.

#### THE FISH

The waters where fish breed and feed must be protected from destruction, and the fish stocks themselves must be protected from the dangerous pressures of overfishing.

*First*, estuaries. If any single place can be called the cradle of the world's fish, it is estuaries, where fresh and salt waters meet. But in the last ten years, more than 55,000 acres of estuaries on the East Coast of the U.S. alone have been filled in, dredged out, or ruined. With the disappearance of each acre goes a storehouse of food for fish and shellfish, and a place where most fish spend a part of their life cycles. The catch of seafood which is dependent on estuaries amounts to nearly four billion pounds a year, and brings over \$300 million annually to fishermen. Early this year I introduced a bill, S. 695, to give the Interior Department authority to protect vital estuaries from destruction. The House is nearing completion of its work on a similar bill, H.R. 25, and I am confident the Senate will act this session on a companion measure. This is a vitally important measure for the fishing industry, and I am hopeful that its members will be energetic in supporting it.

*Second*, the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act. We must continue our efforts under this Act and continue to protect the spawning grounds of those fish which are born, spawn and die in fresh water, but who mature in the salt water. The salmon, the herring—these fish are vital to American fishermen, and they and others must be protected. I will propose legislation next year to strengthen this act.

*Third*, international agreements. We must be very aggressive in seeking mutual agreements with other countries on the best methods of preventing over-fishing and the consequent depletion of fish stocks. For example, we have an agreement with Russia on limiting the size of vessels her fishermen use in the waters off the Pacific Northwest, and also on their fishing in certain areas technically beyond the 12-mile jurisdiction of the U.S. A delegation from the U.S. will travel to Russia on November 13, as Senator Magnuson mentioned on Wednesday, for the final phase of negotiations on similar matters for the waters off the Northeastern states—the Grand Banks, Georges Bank, Stellwagen Bank, Nantucket Shoals, and others. Senator Magnuson also discussed in detail the need to construct international agreements on the annual catch of various species, and I subscribe fully to the need both for the agreements themselves and, even more important, for an effective policing machinery.

*Fourth*, the fishing grounds. We all know of the disastrous effects on fish of using explosives for off-shore oil exploration. We all know of the thousands of nets torn when

snagged on underwater refuse. We all know of men injured or killed when unexploded bombs dragged up in nets suddenly explode. And we all know of the sludge, garbage and other wastes and refuse dumped into the sea. We continue to dump refuse into the ocean at the risk of ruining forever the fishing grounds themselves and the fish which use them.

The Marine Sanctuaries Study Act of 1967, S. 2415, of which I am a sponsor would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to survey and study which specific underwater areas should be preserved and protected from exploitation or dumping. If passed, this would help guarantee that our prime fishing grounds are not destroyed or forever damaged, but continue to produce the fish they always have.

*Fifth*, research. We must continue our basic research into fish spawning, migration, feeding habits and resilience to heavy fishing. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the National Science Foundation, the Sea Grant Colleges, the Office of Naval Research—all these and more are financing studies in this field, and they are increasing our fund of knowledge daily. Last year's creation of the Cabinet-level National Council on Marine Resources will mean that for the first time the various research programs will be closely coordinated, and this can only mean better information for the fishing industry. I will request of this Council that a mechanism be set up whereby the members of the fishing industry themselves will have a voice in what research that is done.

In short, there are a few existing efforts aimed at protecting the waters and the fish underway, but they need to be both expanded and supplemented by measures presently pending in Congress.

#### THE FISHERMEN

*Sixth*, the fishing fleet. On September 18th of this year, I introduced, as part of the proposed Fisheries Development Act of 1967, an amendment to the Fishing Vessel Construction Subsidy Act of 1964. My amendment would change the subsidy rate for construction of new fishing vessels to a flat 50 per cent, and eliminate time-consuming paperwork involved in obtaining comparative bids from foreign shipyards. This can eliminate the bottleneck in the program, a bottleneck which is clear in its statistics: from December, 1964, through June, 1967, only 55 subsidy applications were approved and only 22 contracts were actually let. This program activity is far too small to have any major impact on our outmoded fishing fleet, and it is the reason I believe the subsidy program must be amended. Furthermore, I will introduce legislation in this session of Congress to provide more favorable loan terms under the Fisheries Loan Program.

*Seventh*, the fishermen. Another provision of the Fisheries Development Act would create a Fisheries Extension Service in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This extension service could prove a milestone in the development of modern capabilities in America's fishermen, just as the extension service of the Department of Agriculture did for America's farmers. Vast amounts of information on fishing techniques, currents, bottom topography, and so forth are generated by the more than twenty government agencies involved in oceanography, but they are not correlated or gathered in any single location. This is where an extension service would be useful—it would provide the means for a port extension officer, or teams of port extension officers, to brief fishermen on new developments.

A companion to this extension service, also provided for in the Fisheries Development Act, is a program of Federal technical assistance grants. These grants should be used to demonstrate the power of new technology by

financing the purchase and demonstration of advanced equipment.

*Eighth*, state laws. Presently, regulation of the fisheries is governed by a welter of overlapping and contradictory state laws, which were in many cases developed years ago and never brought up-to-date. The Fisheries Development Act calls for a comprehensive study of state laws and regulations, designed to give us the information we need to proceed to a common sense, instead of haphazard, regulation of the fisheries.

In short, we need to overhaul what little machinery we have to help the individual fisherman increase his knowledge and his capabilities, through education, and to upgrade his ship, through assisting in construction costs.

#### THE PROCESSORS AND MARKETERS

Fishermen can bring their catch to the pier, and the catch can be unloaded—but there must be a major new effort to develop a national marketing campaign for fish and fisheries' products if the rebirth of the industry is to reach its potential.

*Ninth*, cooperatives and marketing agreements. Under Title II of the Fisheries Development Act, fishermen and fish processors would be encouraged to band together in voluntary, dues-paying organizations for the joint advertising of marketing of their products, and would be exempted from the anti-trust laws if they did so. Similar legislation exists for farmers, and it is, to my mind, one reason why the agriculture industry's performance in marketing has far outstripped the fishing industry's.

Formation of cooperatives and marketing groups has proceeded faster on the West and Gulf Coasts than on the East Coast. This may reflect only the traditional individualism of the Yankee, but it hurts the fishing industry of the Northeast, and I urge my fellow Yankees to follow in the steps of their Southern and Western colleagues. As the Department of the Interior has pointed out, only 10 per cent of American fishermen belong to cooperatives, but they produce 20 per cent of the marketed seafood.

*Tenth*, fish protein concentrate. Another important step for the processors and marketers of fish is the development of new products. Main among these must be fish protein concentrate, which can create a whole new processing industry as well as open up whole new markets. Last year the Congress authorized funds for the construction of one and the leasing of another plant for the commercial production of FPC. These plants, when operational, can be dramatic evidence of what FPC will mean to the industry and to the consumer.

In August I proposed an Amendment to the Foreign Aid bill which authorized \$2.5 million to encourage the use of FPC in the developing nations of the world. Specifically, the Amendment, which passed the Senate August 16 and the House a week later, would provide for diet introduction studies and demonstration feeding programs in Asia, in Latin America, and in Africa. In the short run, the Amendment will mean that AID will purchase \$1 million worth of FPC on the American market, and will include FPC in food shipments overseas. In the long run, wide-spread use of FPC in our foreign aid program could help transform the fishing industry, by providing a market for fish now discarded. This would mean work all year, without seasonal fluctuation, and conservation of our fisheries resources, by providing a wider range of useful species.

But we must do more research into the means of producing FPC if we are ever to realize its full potential. Another provision of the Fisheries Development Act would increase the funds available for research and development into the means of reducing whole fish to FPC, research which is badly needed and which should proceed quickly.

Presently, only one process of the three basic types—physical, biological and chemical—is approved, but I believe this to be only a temporary situation. When one looks at the world's race against the clock of hunger, one comes to the inescapable conclusion that we should be doing, today, all the research we can so that when our budgetary restraints are less severe we could move swiftly into the production of this invaluable substance.

In short, we must urge our processors and marketers to take advantage of the strength of unity and the power of new products. Then, and only then, will the consumer respond to fisheries products with the same enthusiasm as he does to agricultural products.

The ten specific points I have just cited can provide the nucleus of a program for the rebirth of the fishing industry, but they will do so only if the voices of the industry—of the fishermen, of the processors, of the unions, of the management, and of the marketers—are heard in Congress in favor of them.

At present, the National Fisheries Institute speaks as a national voice for the industry, but it cannot do so with the authority or decisiveness of some other national organizations. The reason is plain: The industry has never thought it needed a powerful, unified voice. I would like to take issue with this complacency by citing a few examples of its result.

Many U.S. fishermen favor the establishment of import quotas on groundfish. But the importers, also members of the fish industry, are against quotas because it would deprive them of their livelihoods. Similarly, New England ground fishermen were in favor of extending the territorial fishing limit from three to twelve miles in 1966, while their colleagues in the Gulf of Mexico and on the Southern West Coast were not, fearing reprisals from foreign governments whose shore waters they fished. The difficulty of establishing priorities among these conflicting positions would greatly ease if there were a single, national voice for the industry.

Further, I think the formation and operation of such a national association would have an immediate effect on the programs available to help the fishing industry and on the funds available under these programs. I urge all members from all parts of the industry to resolve their differences, and to join forces in the common cause—for the cause itself is too important to be stalled by small differences.

A last area I would like to discuss is the troublesome one of import restrictions. The figures do indeed show a steep rise in imports, as Senator Magnuson explored in depth on Wednesday. And they show specific instances in which fishermen and businesses have been hurt by the imports. It is small wonder, then, that sentiment in the industry favors broad restrictions on imports of foreign fish and fish products.

It is my own feeling that we should take this step only as a last resort. I believe that we, as a nation, can compete equally with any other nation in the world provided that our equipment is up-to-date and efficient. That is why the thrust of my efforts has been to develop programs of assistance for the development of a vigorous industry, for the introduction of new techniques, and for the construction of new vessels. I believe in the strengths of American industry and enterprise, and believe that if our commercial fishing industry is reborn that we will recapture the business our fishermen have now lost to foreign competition.

But because there is a long lead-time involved in reconstructing our fleets and undertaking a large program of public education, there may well be a need for a bill of the type introduced by Senator Wayne Morse, to limit groundfish imports.

In closing, let me emphasize that the need for a regeneration of the fishing industry as a whole should transcend the needs of the component parts, and that only through a strong national association can the program be enacted.

The first Chapter of the Bible admonishes man to "have dominion over the fishes of the sea." But we never will, so long as our ships are outmoded and our knowledge slight. We must put our knowledge and our capabilities to work, as we never have before.

There must be a national voice, speaking clearly for the fishing industry. For only in this way will the industry's future be as proud as its past.

### THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE TREATED WITH RESPECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this morning's mail I received a copy of a WTOP editorial by Jack Jurey which I think is worthy of the attention of the Senate. Mr. Jurey, in a few words, compresses a lot of meaning in what he has to say. In part, he says:

President Johnson, for one, doesn't deserve the cruel things said about him the last couple of days.

I have been somewhat disturbed by the vilification and obscenities which have been hurled in the direction of the Chief Executive, the scorn heaped on the President, the demonstrations against Lady Bird and other acts which I think are beneath the dignity of the people who have the right to redress differences through petition and the ballot box. It is my very strong belief that the right of dissent guaranteed under the Constitution should always be allowed, but that right does not entail license, anarchy, or a breaking of the law.

Insofar as the Office of the Presidency is concerned, it should be treated with respect and courtesy, and that applies to the individual who happens to hold it at a given time. In other words, all Presidents, who only hold the office temporarily, should be entitled to the respect which the permanent Office of the Presidency calls for and is entitled to.

The President is trying as hard as he knows how to find an honorable way out of the difficulty in which we find ourselves in Vietnam. He has not succeeded to date but that does not mean his efforts will diminish. We may agree or disagree with him, but certainly we ought to be aware of the fact that he is seeking an honorable way out; that he will continue to do so; and that, in so doing, he is representing the will and the desire of the American people as a whole no matter how they may be designated. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DEMONSTRATION AS AN ARGUMENT

This is a WTOP Editorial.

The United States is a country built on the principle that the more people argue about public issues, the more informed their final decisions are likely to be. What we saw here in Washington over the weekend in the peace demonstration was a kind of argument conducted for the most part with dignity

and within the limits of the law. Of course, among the many thousands who assembled there was a core of people intent on making trouble for the sake of trouble itself. This minority got in a few licks at the Pentagon, was restrained and eventually dispersed. Those militants didn't achieve anything; their only result was to tend to discredit the whole protest effort.

Now that it's all over, what's been proved? Not very much, we think, that wasn't known before. Very few wars are popular and the Vietnam war is more unpopular than most. It is inconclusive, bloody and apparently interminable. The premises on which it is being fought can be subjected to severe intellectual challenge. But the men at the top level of government who are guiding the war are not bloodthirsty ogres. They are mortal men looking for an honorable way out of a desperate dilemma. President Johnson, for one, doesn't deserve the cruel things said about him the last couple of days. His critics are quick to condemn our policy, but the alternatives they offer are apt to be fuzzy, fuzzy-minded or both.

Vietnam should be a matter of public debate because that's how this country operates. It would be nice, however, if that debate could deal with some of the hard questions that need answering: how, for example, do we control the process of escalation and how do we disengage without doing serious injury to our own interests and those of the South Vietnamese who have joined with us?

These are not easy matters. They will not be solved by easy slogans. Nor, certainly, by peaceniks who fancy that an assault on the Pentagon is in some way an assault on the heart of the problem.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

### THE COPPER INDUSTRY STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears that the strike in the auto industry has been settled. It appears that the strike involving the steel haulers has been settled. However, in the copper industry there is a strike which has been in existence now for more than 100 days. There is no solution in sight, and the segment of our economy affected includes many of our Western States, and, incidentally, States in the East and Middle West which have fabricating plants.

Over the past several weeks, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and I have met with members of the union and with Steelworkers Union representatives in Washington, at their request. We have met with Secretaries McNamara, Wirtz, and representatives of Secretary Trowbridge, at the suggestion of the President; and we have also met with the chairman of the Anaconda Co.

We reported back to the people of Montana the results of all of these discussions and have urged the people we represent, as well as the Anaconda Co., to get together and to stay with the situation until an agreement is reached.

But, I find myself rising, once again, to stress the serious economic situation posed by the current national copper strike. Now in its 15th week, the strike is characterized by stalled negotiations, a dwindling but evidently a sufficient national supply of copper, higher prices for fabricators, reduced income for workers and companies, and a serious curtailment of State income in States like Montana.



Only a plentiful reserve of copper has permitted negotiations to drag out to this point. But reserves are shrinking, as reflected in constantly rising prices for the metal. It is my earnest hope that both sides will redouble their efforts to reach an agreement.

There continue to be suggestions that if the parties to the dispute do not resolve their differences, the Federal Government will step in. As I have pointed out repeatedly—most recently in a floor statement last Monday, and before that in Montana—I feel it would be a mistake at this time to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. If no agreement were reached during the 80-day period, the strike would resume in the middle of winter. I say again that it is the responsibility of the parties to the dispute to resolve it—and get on with the business of bringing a measure of prosperity back to the affected regions.

Mr. President, an article entitled "Art of Nonbargaining: Copper Strike," published in today's Wall Street Journal, explains the dilemma posed by the strike, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ART OF NONBARGAINING: COPPER STRIKE

(By Michael K. Drapkin)

The copper industry strike is in its 15th week, and the casual observer is entitled to assume that this prolonged shutdown is a product of the clash of two strong interests as they come to grips with economic issues.

But the casual observer wouldn't be quite correct. The closedown of this important metals industry in a dispute between copper producers and, essentially, the United Steelworkers of America, has endured this long and is likely to continue a good while longer precisely because the two sides haven't come to grips with economic issues.

Meanwhile, most copper capacity, plus some lead and zinc facilities, is closed. More than 42,000 workers are off their jobs in a dozen states. Seven Western states, notably Utah where an estimated 7% to 10% of the work force is idle, are taking a severe economic pounding.

For the first half of the fiscal year that began July 1, Utah cut by 4% the budgets of some state agencies as a result of lost revenue. Montana and Arizona have imposed emergency "temporary" taxes to make up for funds not flowing into state tills.

Utah officials estimate the strike is costing \$288,000 daily in lost wages. They say \$67,000 to \$100,000 a day is being lost in state and local taxes. The strike is eating into the nation's supply of copper, much of which goes for defense purposes, though users still seem to have good stocks.

Why the two sides haven't come to grips with the issues is a matter of conjecture. It seems clear that neither the industry nor the Steelworkers union is in any hurry to get the mines open. Whatever their motives, just how they've been going about avoiding the task of doing some honest-to-goodness negotiation for more than three months should be instructive for that casual observer in the art of labor-management non-bargaining.

**STILL FAR APART**  
The original strike deadline was July 1, but the contract with eight copper companies was extended by the USW and 17 other unions to July 15. The extension hardly seems to have been necessary, since the two sides were nowhere near reaching any agreement. They're still far apart.

Not that they've been as far apart as the

labels that each side put on their offers and demands might indicate. That's one reason they've been able to avoid knocking heads on the issues. The different method each side uses for evaluating its own position and that of its adversary has muddled up the dispute even before haggling over the terms could start.

Copper makers presented offers that they said amounted to wage-and-benefit increases of about 50 cents an hour over three years. The union countered with demands that it didn't publicly label, but which it was understood to value at around \$1.20 an hour over three years.

Ostensibly this was a simple enough, though sizable, bargaining gap. But the industry and union have made it much more complex. The companies, for instance, say the union's original demands would really cost \$2 an hour, maybe \$3. And the union figures the companies are really offering only 40 cents. What little talking there has been (and until the last few weeks, there has been extremely little) has centered around arguing that the other side isn't offering as much, or demanding as little, as it claims.

A key factor in this inability to agree on what the disagreement amounts to is the concept of "impact," sometimes called "creep" by copper industry officials. This involves the effect of any wage increase on certain labor costs directly tied to wage rates, such as overtime pay. The companies insist that this can boost the cost of a wage package by 20%. The union says such reasoning is highly questionable.

In any event, the two parties successfully resisted for some time getting beyond this argument over definition. Even when the union and Kennecott Copper Corp. were pushed into more consequential discussions by Utah Gov. Rampton three weeks ago, the argument remained—and a new one of similar character cropped up.

The USW scaled down its demand to what it said amounted to about 99 cents an hour. More like \$1.57, said Kennecott. Not only did it ignore "impact," the company said, but union figures on pension improvement costs were 15 cents an hour too low. Kennecott thus accused the USW of renegeing on its promise to detail a 99-cent demand.

For nearly two weeks, platoons of cost accountants haggled over whose methods were more up to date until, finally, the parties reached an agreement: Not to settle the total contract dispute nor on the valuation of each side's position, nor even which pension accounting system was correct. Kennecott simply agreed to supply some "underlying data," while the USW promised to "do some more work" on its pension costing.

"That point could have been cleared up in two hours, much less two weeks," says one Utah government official.

Meanwhile, whenever Federal or state government people tried to move the bargaining ahead, the two sides reacted angrily. One official publicly relayed the union's proposal to ask for 99 cents an hour, and Kennecott assailed him for "endorsing" the union's valuation of its demand.

"THAT'LL SUIT US"

At a negotiating session early this month between the union and Kennecott, a Federal mediator made several suggestions and comments until a union representative asked him to keep silent. He then said, "That's fine with me. In fact, I won't even come to tomorrow's session." The reply: "That'll suit us." Last Thursday the Kennecott-USW talks broke down amid recriminations by each side that the other wouldn't bargain in good faith.

And Utah Gov. Rampton, who has been insistent that the parties get together more often and get down to business when they do meet, has been clubbed a couple of times by Kennecott.

Once, for instance, the governor predicted the eventual settlement would fall within 10

cents of 75 cents an hour, about halfway between the union's demand of 99 cents and Kennecott's offer on June 7 of 50.6 cents. "Both the company and the union know this," he said, "and yet neither will come closer than 24 cents to this, even though they know they have got to move toward a central position."

Kennecott quickly said the governor "had absolutely no authorization on the part of the company to make any statement concerning a company attitude as to an area in which this year's negotiations might be settled."

One breakthrough opportunity seemed to appear a week ago, when locals of the Steelworkers and several other unions reached a settlement at small Pima Mining Co., valued by the company at 75 cents an hour over three years. (Some industry analysts say the cost of the package is closer to \$1; while companies tend to boost union estimates of demands during negotiations, they often scale down settlements to show a victory.)

About 500 members of various locals at an Anaconda Co. mine in Nevada then offered to accept identical wage and fringe benefits, but Anaconda quickly squashed the proposal as too costly, saying the miners would be offered an agreement like the one finally arrived at in talks at main Anaconda bargaining with the USW.

The union called the Pima agreement an example of "realistic collective bargaining" that it hoped would be "duplicated" by the bigger companies. Union officials said some "real give and take" led to the settlement. But the companies say Pima's operations aren't comparable to those of the bigger concerns.

Why this reluctance to get down to cases, after three months of strike? The reasons are far from clear. "I know there's something not above board, but I don't know what it is. Maybe history will record it, I can't," says one government official.

The union charges that the companies are stalling things so that the strike will start to pinch the nation enough to force the Government to avoid resisting a price increase once the contract is settled. The industry says the USW won't be reasonable until it gets its previously stated goal of industry-wide bargaining, instead of the current company-by-company talks; the union says it wants uniform wages and benefits, but doesn't care that much about industrywide bargaining.

It's quite possible that internal considerations bear on the length of the strike. One industry man says the slow pace of talks stems mainly from "power struggles" in both the union and company ranks. "We both know we're going to have to compromise, but other things will have to be settled first."

**YOUNGER AND MORE FLEXIBLE**

At the companies, industry sources say, a number of younger men who have recently filled executive positions are more inclined to compromise, but considerable say-so still lies with the older, less flexible industry leaders. As for the union, the copper concerns at least insist that the USW is taking an especially hard line because it wants to show the other unions and its new mining membership that it's tough. The union could also be flexing its muscles in advance of the 1968 steel bargaining. The Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, which previously bargained separately with the copper industry, merged with the USW just prior to the current strike.

One state government official believes both sides think they can get a better settlement if the Federal Government steps in than in collective bargaining. This is always problematical, of course; frequently, unions think they don't get as much when the Government supervises a settlement, and companies often believe they're forced to give away too much that way.

The two parties have been able to put off hard-core negotiations because the nation's supply of copper, plus that available abroad, has proved to be surprisingly large. When the pinch comes, the picture is likely to change, especially if the Government decides it better move. Until then, the strike goes on—as the two sides artfully dodge any opportunities for settling it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I heartily concur with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. Collective bargaining must be just that: Collective bargaining. The people who are confronted with these problems at the start have to sit down and bargain together. The United Auto Workers, for instance, had hundreds of various shop rules in conflict but they sat down with the company and worked them out and finally reached a solution. We have had complete failure, in the copper strike, of these people getting together.

Kennecott got together only after Governor Rampton, of Utah, knocked some heads together and said, "You have got to sit down and bargain."

But even that failed. Even talking about the same program in the same language, the United Steelworkers, after Governor Rampton suggested that they come in with a counter offer, said that they would come in with something under \$1.

As pointed out in the article published in the Wall Street Journal, which my colleague has placed in the RECORD, it was 99 cents so far as the steelworkers were concerned, and around \$1.50 so far as the company was concerned. Now surely they could resolve the conflicts, when the auditors come in. In a few hours they should negotiate them. They should sit down and work them out.

There can be no collective bargaining when someone sits in one corner and someone in another and they will not meet together.

The Pima settlement should be the pattern for the settlement of the whole copper industry. The Anaconda Co. in Utah has about the same numbers, about the same problems, and about the same working conditions as Pima. They should have been started and we should have had a cascading settlement after the Pima agreement was reached.

Kennecott has stated that there is no pattern at all, that there is no reason whatever to continue collective bargaining. Therefore we still do not have anything.

Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps Dodge should do just as the Ford Motor Co. has done and just as the truckers have done. We do not want to tell them what their settlement should be, but they should sit down and make collective bargaining work, or the people of America are going to get so tired of it that they will step in and take it over.

Let me say one word about the Taft-Hartley law. One of the unfair features of the Taft-Hartley law is the proposition that an injunction can be sought at any time.

We should have provided in the Taft-Hartley law, of course, that when the public interest becomes involved during a strike, the Federal Government should

step in and state, "We want an injunction early in this strike." It would be most unfair for us to come in now and say, as a matter of public interest, after 100 days of a strike, that we should invoke an injunction of 80 days under the Taft-Hartley law, which would be around the Christmas holidays, and then strike all over again in the middle of winter, especially in Montana, and then have to go through this process all over again. I hope that we do not look to the Taft-Hartley law. I know that we have a sufficient supply of copper to take care of our military needs. I wish that the people at Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps Dodge, and the United Steelworkers would start to negotiate, and instead of the art of nonbargaining, demonstrate the art of bargaining collectively.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with my colleague about the inadvisable use of Taft-Hartley in this situation. If it is ever going to be invoked, it should be invoked at the beginning of a strike and not after it has gone on for 3 or 4 months. Its nullifying effect is so evident as to make it practically worthless.

So far as the Government is concerned, to the best of my knowledge, and I think I speak with a degree of authority, there will be no release of copper from the stockpile, and there is no intention on the part of the Government to interfere otherwise in the present strike. It is our hope and the hope of all of us in the copper-producing States, especially in Montana, that the process of free collective bargaining between the companies and the unions will operate as it started to operate briefly in Butte on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week.

It is my understanding that at the first meeting there were in excess of 100 union representatives from all over the country as well as officials from Anaconda. I believe it would be better if fewer union officials met with the companies concerned. I believe it would be a good idea if the officials of the Mediation and Conciliation Service were used as go-betweens. But I do want to say that in the interest of the people whom we represent, the time is long past due when both the companies and the unions met around the negotiating table, operating on a day-to-day basis and, if need be, on a 24-hour basis, in order to achieve a settlement before winter steps in. Only in that way can the difficulties which have confronted the people of Montana for over 100 days now be alleviated to some degree.

The fact is, we are losing many good people, people who are going to the coast and elsewhere. We do not want to lose these Montanans but a number, I understand, have nevertheless departed the State; a factor that alone demonstrates the grave effect this impasse is having.

Mr. METCALF. Again, the most important thing for the unions in the copper industry and for the executives of the copper industry to do is to sit down and negotiate and settle this strike. There is no work in the management of that business, and in the management of union affairs, more important than to negotiate, as my colleague has stated,

24 hours a day if need be, in order to reach a settlement.

This business of meeting only 1 hour a week is nonsense. It is destroying the economy of many States and it is destroying the whole process of collective bargaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is up to the unions and companies, not to the Federal Government, to settle this strike, and to settle it on the basis of free collective bargaining.

#### A NEW CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today to say a word about a new crisis in the Middle East.

The Middle East and a nervous world face a new crisis today over the sinking this past weekend of Israel's destroyer, *Elath*. This violent breach of the ceasefire, following other outbreaks of sporadic fighting on land, sea, and in the air, could well shatter in a tragic instant the tenuous truce in the area.

I hope very much that Israel will restrain a very understandable military reaction in force since a new round of full-scale warfare could seriously endanger efforts to effect a peace. However, if Israel exercises such restraint, the other nations, especially the major powers, must face up to their responsibilities and at once.

First, negotiations for a peace settlement cannot now be deferred. It is the duty of the United States and the other major power members of the Security Council of the U.N. to press for such negotiations promptly. As peace negotiations demand concurrence of the parties, direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States are really the only way; true peace cannot be imposed from outside by third parties. Since Israel is in possession of territories the Arab States wish to have returned, the United States and the other powers should be able to bring the Arab States to some form of direct negotiations at this time.

Second, the Soviet Union must be warned that its crash program of rearming the United Arab Republic and other Arab States—not only in quantity but with the latest in advanced sophisticated weaponry—has again reached a peril point of endangering world peace. This needs to be said openly and publicly by the United States in and outside of the United Nations.

Since 1948, the peace of the Middle East has been shattered by three full-scale wars between Israel and the Arab States, plus innumerable skirmishes, border raids, terrorism, economic warfare, boycotts and blockades, propaganda and diplomatic assaults. How long world peace can survive under these conditions and under sudden emergencies like the attack and sinking of the *Elath* is just too dangerous to risk.

A massive and aggressive effort, especially of U.S. diplomacy, is urgently required. Considering the posture of both Israel and the Arab States, a formula for at least undertaking negotiations can be found. The only way, in my judgment, to supersede the new crisis atmosphere clearly indicating a resumption of hostilities is by peace negotiations between the principal parties and an end to the



Soviet-spurred arms race in the Middle East. The hour is late; let us not hold off decisive action until it is beyond recall.

I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CLEAN AIR: OUR MOST BASIC RESOURCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to a fine, 14-page report recommending a five-point program on clean air, by the Republican Coordinating Committee, and ask unanimous consent that it should be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### CLEAN AIR: OUR MOST BASIC RESOURCE

The principal sources of air pollution are the combustion processes which lie at the heart of many of our most vital industries and services—transportation, heating, electric power, and incineration. Indeed, a completely combustion-free society would be most primitive. We must realize that pollution is a by-product of our highly developed economy, and learn to think of the cost of adequate control measures as a price we pay for enjoying an advanced standard of living.

The harmful effects of air pollution are numerous and widespread.

Statistical and laboratory evidence appears to link a number of respiratory diseases such as emphysema, bronchitis, asthma, and possibly lung cancer with concentrations of air pollution. For example, the lung cancer death rate in large metropolitan areas is twice the rural rate, even after full allowance is made for differences in smoking habits. Scientists believe that this may be explained in part by the higher levels of air pollution generally found in urban centers.

Levels of carbon monoxide found in heavy traffic may reduce driver alertness and reaction time and correspondingly increase the probability of automobile accidents. In each of six cities where recent measurements were made in traffic, at least 10 percent of the samples exceeded what is considered to be a safe concentration of carbon monoxide.

Photochemical smog and other obstructions to vision caused by pollution can be physically irritating, and often hamper the safe operation of motor vehicles and aircraft. The Civil Aeronautics Board reported six aircraft accidents in 1962 in which smoke, haze, sand, or dust was listed as a contributory cause.

Air pollution damages crops and vegetation. For example, in New Jersey pollution injury to 36 commercial crops has been reported, and in parts of Florida orange trees have been severely damaged.

Air pollution disasters occur—given unfavorable weather conditions which permit the build-up of unusually high concentrations of pollutants. Six major episodes accompanied by death and disease have been recorded over the past generation.

Although complete scientific explanations of the relation of air pollution to specific health effects and other harmful occurrences are not in every case available, the evidence does point to air pollution as a matter which should today be a major concern of all Americans and is a major concern of the Republican Party.

Today's problems of atmospheric pollution will in the future become more severe and the incidence of harmful effects will increase apace unless appropriate actions are taken. This is portrayed graphically by the following projections of increased activity over the

next decade among the major sources of pollution:

The number of motor vehicles on our highways—autos, buses and trucks—will increase from 90 million to 120 million.

Output of electrical power will more than double and some of the increase will require generation from coal and oil fuel sources.

Industrial production is expected to increase by over 50 percent.

Urban population will grow twice as rapidly as the population as a whole.

Our concern and our efforts must, therefore, be geared not just to the problems of today; we must anticipate and plan for the future. For air pollution is growing—faster than our population, and faster than our efforts to combat it—and only a vigorous and sustained commitment can save and preserve our most basic resource.

### A REPUBLICAN CLEAN AIR PROGRAM

Republicans believe that past efforts to cope with the mounting problem of air pollution in a growing urban society have been inadequate, and recommend a redoubling of effort on the part of all concerned—government, industry, and private citizens.

At the urging of President Eisenhower in his 1955 State of the Union address and with support of Republicans in both Houses, the first Federal law in the field of air pollution was enacted by the 84th Congress. This basic law has been elaborated and strengthened by major Congressional actions in 1963 and 1965.

To lead the commitment to cleaner air as we approach the 1970's, the Republican Party proposes a broad, constructive five part program as outlined below.

#### 1. Eliminating Gaps in our Knowledge and Technical Capability.

Efforts to combat air pollution control must include a frank awareness of the limits of our knowledge of the problem and of our ability to apply control measures effectively and efficiently. Gaps in our knowledge and technical capability appear across the entire spectrum of the air pollution problem.

With regard to health effects, in April 1967 the U.S. Surgeon General stated:

"It would be foolish to say that we do not need more research on the health effects of air pollution. Of course we do."

Intensified research is needed to gain more complete scientific explanations of the effects of specific pollutants on human health and to determine the levels at which air pollution becomes harmful. To date the Public Health Service has established and published data on harmful levels for only one of five major classes of pollution. Lacking additional information, local control authorities have great difficulty in setting desirable air quality objectives and standards.

Another deficiency is that precise measurements of the actual levels of pollution in the atmosphere of our major cities in many cases are not available. At the present, continuous measurements are made in just nine cities. In air pollution control, as in any other activity, it is difficult to know where you are going and how to get there, unless you know where you are now.

Related to this is a lack of well developed equipment and procedures for measuring emission levels from particular pollution sources accurately and rapidly. In the case of automobiles, for instance, no simple instrument has been developed which would permit large-scale annual inspection of cars equipped with exhaust controls. Use of available instrumentation either would not give sufficiently accurate readings, or would involve unduly time-consuming test procedures.

Of utmost importance is the fact that, according to many witnesses, the engineering technology of emission control equipment has not progressed as rapidly as our desire

to combat the pollution problem. For example, full-scale tests of one of the most promising methods of removing sulfur oxide emissions from the stacks of electric power plants have not yet been conducted. Also, preliminary experience with auto emission control devices in California indicates that the effectiveness of these devices degrades with time, partially nullifying the large expenditures required, and pointing to the need for improved technology.

The above factors taken together indicate that the planning of an air pollution control program can be seriously hampered by our lack of knowledge or technical capability in many vital areas. This situation has been caused in part by a neglect of research and development activities on the part of the Federal Government. In 1966 the Federal Government allocated only \$14 million to air pollution research and development activities. This amounts to less than one-tenth of one percent of the total Federal research and development budget, and does not appear consistent with the verbal emphasis and priority which the Administration has placed on air pollution control. Moreover, by shifting and moving Federal pollution research facilities from place-to-place, the Administration has created unnecessary delays in our research efforts.

We recommend an accelerated and improved research and development program, under the leadership of the Public Health Service, to reduce or eliminate the gaps in our scientific and technological knowledge of air pollution and control methods. No amount of legislation, regulations, or verbal support will solve the air pollution problem until we have the scientific and technical tools at hand to plan and implement an effective control effort.

In addition to plugging the gaps identified above, an accelerated research and development effort should also be directed toward greater exploration of techniques to recover usable products such as sulfur from industrial emissions, and to the investigation of radical changes in energy sources, including research on battery powered automobile engines.

#### 2. Emphasizing Regional Agreements Among State and Local Governments in the Control of Air Pollution.

Republicans continue to believe that air pollution control is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, the policy enunciated by Congress in the Clean Air Act of 1963. For this reason we are distressed by the original version of the Administration's proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 which we find inconsistent with this policy.

The problem of air pollution is not uniform throughout the country. The level, composition, and frequency of occurrence of harmful emissions in the air varies greatly from one locality to another. The prevailing level of sulfur dioxide in New York City is many times greater than in Detroit or San Francisco, which in turn have a greater problem than many small towns and rural communities. To us it is evident that programs to combat air pollution must be tailored to meet the varied needs of individual regions and areas.

The Administration's legislative proposal recognizes the geographical variations of air pollution: a provision of the bill would establish Regional Air Quality Commissions composed of Federal, State and local officials to police pollution on a regional basis. However, the details of the legislation reveal that the Regional Commissions would simply provide a thin veil for greatly expanded Federal control in this field. The bill would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to:

Define and establish (or abolish) Air Quality Regions.

Appoint (or remove) all members of the Regional Commissions, none of whom must

be officials of established State, local, or regional air pollution control agencies.

Control the budgets of the Regional Commissions.

Overrule the Regional Commissioners in the establishment of air quality and emission standards.

Grant any exemptions to such standards for particular industries or activities.

Determine when standards have been violated and issue cease and desist orders to violators.

Plainly, these provisions of the Administration's proposal do not constitute regional control, but rather a prescription for complete Federal control with all power lodged in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This we cannot accept.

For those areas of the nation which would not be included in Air Quality Regions, the Administration proposes to establish uniform emission standards for each industry which contributes to pollution of the atmosphere, backed by Federal enforcement authority. The application of uniform emission standards to any sizable geographic area represents a solution which is bound to be at odds with the intrinsic non-uniformity of the problem. Inevitably, uniform emission standards would be unnecessarily stringent and unfair for some industries, and not sufficiently stringent for others.

Republicans do not advocate a doctrinaire, negative approach to the role of the Federal Government in the enforcement of air pollution regulations. We accept Federal standards for automobiles, since centralized production and high mobility of automobiles make uniform national standards the most practical solution. In the case of interstate air pollution disputes, Federal intervention authority is clearly necessary, and under the 1963 Clean Air Act Federal efforts have resulted in the initiation of pollution abatement actions in nine interstate areas. These are examples of existing Federal enforcement authority which we support.

With regard to new Federal control authority, we endorse the approach embodied in the legislation passed by the Senate on July 18, 1967 with full Republican support. This measure would permit the Federal Government to set and enforce regional air quality standards, but only if the States should fail to act within a prescribed time period after they have received the scientific, technological, and economic information necessary to establish meaningful standards from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But the Administration has failed at this time to make a compelling case for a sudden application of detailed Federal controls in regional areas or for uniform Federal emission standards outside those regional areas.

The Administration proposal also fails to recognize the record of accomplishment and the opportunities for progress at the State, local and regional level aided by the Federal Government under the terms of previous legislation. In 1961 there were 17 air pollution control programs in existence at the State level; today there are 40 established State programs and 130 local agencies engaged in control activities. The budgets of these agencies have doubled over the past three years.

Air pollution does not respect established political boundaries and in many, if not most cases, interstate or metropolitan area solutions are highly desirable. We are encouraged that some State and local governments have been moving in this direction. Two interstate compacts involving Indiana-Illinois and New York-New Jersey have been approved by the respective States and await Congressional action. Of the 50 largest cities in the nation, 22 or nearly one-half are engaged in regional or metropolitan area control programs.

State and local governments should take steps to strengthen existing air pollution

control programs or establish new ones, as necessary, and we recommend strongly the greater use of interstate compacts and metropolitan area solutions in this field. This approach is the best means to combat a problem which does not match established political boundaries and which is so clearly not uniform across the nation.

The Federal Government can do more to encourage interstate and metropolitan solutions to the problem of air pollution. At the present time multi-jurisdiction air pollution control agencies may receive Federal grants for 75 percent of the cost of establishing control programs compared to 67 percent for single jurisdiction agencies, and for 60 percent of the cost of maintaining such programs, compared to 50 percent for single jurisdiction agencies. For many State and local governments these small differentials favoring multi-jurisdiction solutions are probably insufficient to surmount the normal political and administrative hurdles of entering into interstate or metropolitan area agreements.

We recommend that the degree of Federal financial support for multi-jurisdiction solutions be sharply increased to encourage formation of interstate and metropolitan control agencies. Further, we recommend that multi-jurisdiction agencies be given first priority in Federal technical assistance activities.

### 3. The Need for Economic Analysis

Air pollution represents an economic drain on our society. Lives may be cut short, medical bills are increased, crops are damaged, and cleaning expenses run up. At the same time, the economic impact of controlling air pollution promises to be far-reaching in terms of public and private outlays, possible market and job dislocations, and even changes in foreign trade patterns. In dealing with air pollution we must include an explicit awareness and an open discussion of the economic implications of the effects of pollution and of various control measures.

The Federal Government has given inadequate attention to this aspect of the problem. There has been almost no explicit analysis or discussion of economic factors in Presidential messages or in Executive agency announcements or publications on air pollution.

We recommend that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare be required to present economic analyses of all proposed legislation, standards, and regulations relating to air pollution with estimates of the total costs to be incurred and the expected benefits. The Congress and the general public are entitled to this information in order to permit a balanced public discussion of the issues. We recommend that State and local control agencies conduct similar analyses whenever possible.

### 4. Tax Benefits for Controlling Pollution

Polluted air affects nearly everyone and the costs of control measures should be widely shared. At present the costs of pollution control are borne principally by industries through outlays for control equipment, and by their customers through higher prices. One way to distribute more fairly the costs of combatting pollution is through a system of tax advantages to industry for investments in pollution control devices. A number of States have adopted laws of this type. Legislation to permit an increased investment credit or to allow rapid depreciation for pollution control equipment on Federal tax returns has been introduced by Republicans in both the Senate and the House and has received widespread support. We urge hearings and enactment of a bill embodying these principles.

Another means of encouraging industry to make the necessary outlays is the granting of low interest loans by an appropriate government agency or authority for the purchase of pollution control equipment. The

State of Pennsylvania is proposing an experimental program of this type, which if successful, could provide a model for similar action by other States.

### 5. Cleaning-up Air Pollution from Federal Installations

In 1963 Congress included in the Clean Air Act a provision requiring all Federal agencies to cooperate in preventing and controlling air pollution from Federal installations and activities. Four years later the Administration has taken virtually no effective abatement action at Federal installations. Executive Orders and directives have been promulgated to give the appearance of action, but very little has actually been accomplished. A prime example of the Federal contribution to air pollution is the Kenilworth Dump, 5 miles from the White House, where 1,000 tons of garbage and trash are burned into the open air each day. Meeting after meeting of Federal officials has been held, promises to the public have been made, but the burning goes on.

If the Federal Government is going to legislate in the field of air pollution, it must in its own activities adhere to exemplary practices in controlling harmful emissions from Federal buildings and installations. The present Administration has violated this principle.

The Republican Party calls for immediate abatement action at all Federal installations.

### SUMMARY

Air pollution is pre-eminently an urban problem. This fact supports the proposition that increasingly the future of America is linked to the future of our great urban centers.

Today, two thirds of our population lives in metropolitan areas and over 80 percent of the growth in population is concentrated there. This growth and concentration have created an array of public policy problems in fields such as housing, transportation, education, human rights, and natural resources—including the problem of controlling the quality of our air. As we enter the last third of the twentieth century, there is no greater challenge than the design of public policies to meet these problems and to make our urban centers more liveable. The Republican Party accepts this challenge.

The program and policies outlined in this paper can become the basis for a well coordinated attack on the pollution of our atmosphere, and can contribute to the attainment of our goals for urban America.

To summarize, the Republican Party recommends:

1. An accelerated research and development program to reduce or eliminate gaps in our knowledge and in our technical capability, so that our ability to control air pollution will be matched to our desire to do so. The Federal Government should take the lead in this effort.

2. Greater use of regional and metropolitan area agreements among States and local governments in the control of air pollution, so that solutions may be matched to the geographical pattern and wide variations of the problem, and to minimize Federal controls consistent with the approach contained in the legislation recently passed by the Senate. The Federal Government should offer increased financial incentives to State and local governments to encourage them more strongly to enter into regional and metropolitan area agreements.

3. Greater use of economic analysis in the formulation of public policies for air pollution control, so that the economic implications of the problem and of proposed control measures can be more fully understood and considered. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare should be required to present economic analyses of all proposed legislation and regulations in this field.

4. A system of Federal tax benefits to industry for investments in air pollution con-



trol devices, so that the costs of controlling pollution will be widely shared, as well as the benefits. Congress should hold hearings and act favorably on legislation of this type.

5. Effective action rather than words to halt pollution emanating from Federal installations, so that the Federal Government in its own activities will be above reproach and can provide more effective leadership.

We commend this program to the attention of the American public.

The problem of air pollution is fundamentally a question of conservation, which Theodore Roosevelt once described as "dealing intelligently with what we have." Future generations will judge whether this generation dealt intelligently with our most basic resource—the air we breathe.

#### NASSAU COUNTY U.N. DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 22 the Nassau County U.N. Day Committee organized a very successful public meeting at the A. Holly Paterson Auditorium in Uniondale, Long Island. The purpose of the meeting was to commemorate the 22d anniversary of the United Nations. The principal address was delivered by Ambassador Seymour M. Finger, the senior adviser to Ambassador Goldberg.

This meeting was an example of the outstanding public spirit of the citizens of Nassau County. The people of Nassau County and of the town of Oyster Bay have taken a key interest in the work of the United Nations since its founding in 1945. It will be remembered that the original meeting home of the United Nations was Lake Success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a proclamation by Mr. Michael N. Petito, supervisor of the town of Oyster Bay, declaring Tuesday, October 24, 1967, as United Nations Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas, every American President in office since the United Nations was founded in 1945 has shared the belief that the United Nations is an essential element in efforts to achieve a world at peace with freedom and justice for all; and

Whereas, it is imperative that the American people understand fully the major objectives of the Charter of the United Nations, which are: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the sovereign equality of nations, large and small; to establish conditions under which justice and respect for International Law can be maintained; and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and

Whereas, the vast majority of the American people believe that the United Nations effectively promotes the peace in the world and favors continuing United States support of the world organization;

Now, therefore, I, Michael N. Petito, Supervisor of the Town of Oyster Bay, declare Tuesday, October 24th, 1967, as United Nations Day, and urge the citizens of the Town to observe that day by studying the United Nations, its accomplishments, its strength, its limitations and its potential for the future, so that this information will contribute to a realistic understanding of the aims, problems and achievements of the United Nations and its associated organizations.

#### ARMY PROCUREMENT POLICY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on three separate occasions I have made speeches on the floor attacking certain military procurement policies which have been employed by the Army. In those speeches I carefully delineated the cases I have questioned, one involving a very small Colorado company and one involving a Brooklyn firm.

The other day, as a result of my speeches on this subject, I had an opportunity to meet with the Secretary of the Army, who, in my opinion, is an extremely fine, very able, and dedicated man. I am delighted that he is serving in that office. At that meeting he gave me a letter, dated October 20, 1967, dealing with the Army's reply to the charges which I had made in my speeches; and I ask unanimous consent at this point that the letter be included in the RECORD, because I want to be completely fair in the presentation of these cases.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: I read with concern your statements in the Congressional Record of 19 and 28 September and 4 October concerning Army procurement policy. I have personally inquired into the matters you raised. For the reasons which follow, my conclusion is that Army actions were made honestly and in accordance with the needs of our combat forces in Southeast Asia.

You raised first the question of award of the research and development contract for a multi-shot portable flamethrower to Northrop Nortronics, and suggested that the award should have been made to Custom Packaging Company of Aurora, Colorado. Nine manufacturers submitted proposals in response to the Army's request. After a careful technical evaluation Nortronics was ranked 1, Custom 9. Weighting certain factors used in the technical evaluation did not affect Custom's ranking, since no company received a lower score in four of the five characteristics evaluated—technical approach, technical personnel, background experience, and facilities. If the elements of the evaluation had not been weighted at all, the ranking of these two companies would have been exactly the same: Nortronics 1, Custom 9.

You emphasized that Custom proposed a price of \$167,608 for the contract, compared to Nortronics' estimate of \$387,000. The Army took these cost proposals into account in making the award. But such cost figures, inevitably based on difficult estimates, cannot be made the controlling factor in a research and development contract, in which the paramount goal is to obtain a product which will meet field requirements. This fact is recognized in the Armed Services Procurement Act, 10 U.S.C., Sec. 2304(a) (11), and also in ASPR 4-106.4 and 4-106.5, which make clear that in research and development contracts estimates of cost seldom can be the controlling factor. Custom's proposal simply was not up to the standard required, and the Army would have been wasting money and imperiling the entire development program to award the contract to a company offering so little prospect of success.

Other questions concerning Custom's efforts to obtain the contract were thoroughly considered by the Comptroller General, who set out in detail the efforts of Custom to interest the Army in its product. See Ms. Comp. Gen. B-160809, 29 June 1967. While

the Army was ready to give Custom every consideration, that hardly can be regarded as a solicitation. The fact the contract was awarded one working day before the date once estimated as the approximate time of award was of no consequence, and Custom was promptly notified. The Army did not use or disclose any of Custom's proprietary data, and the Comptroller General concluded that there was "no substantial basis" for such an allegation.

The other question you raised concerned several aspects of the development and procurement of the AN/PRC-25 and AN/PRC-77 portable field radios. I shall discuss briefly the principal points which you mentioned.

First, you suggest that the Army paid too much—\$951 per unit—for the 4158 PRC-25 radios purchased for the Marine Corps from RCA by contract of 13 August 1965. That contract was awarded by competitive negotiation to meet an urgent requirement from Southeast Asia for 13,158 PRC-25s. Military necessity required delivery of the entire amount by 30 June 1966, 10 months thence. Only two companies—RCA and Memcor—were in production and could meet that deadline. The Army awarded a contract for 9,000 to Memcor, the lowest-price proposer, which represented that company's total capability to meet the deadline. The remaining quantity, 4158, was awarded to RCA at a unit price of \$881.00, not \$951. This price understandably was higher than the \$625 previously bid by RCA on an earlier buy because the quantity was less (4158 instead of 7278), the production leadtime was less (4 months instead of 12) and Government-furnished equipment was less (\$3 per unit instead of \$53).

Second, you expressed concern over the necessity of contracting sole-source for production of the PRC-77 on 28 April 1967. RCA's first production contract called for delivery of a running set of drawings (those used for the initial production run) on 31 March 1967, the date of delivery of the first PRC-77. The initial running set was delivered on 3 May 1967, only 33 days after the originally specified delivery date. This delay resulted from changes in Army operational criteria imposed by new requirements for related communication equipment which were not furnished RCA until February 1967, eight months after contract award. Unavoidable delay by the Army in developing interface data for the related communications security equipment also necessitated a rollback in production deliveries. After negotiations, deliveries were rescheduled to begin in August 1967, five months after the original contract schedule. The contract was modified accordingly. Satisfactory undated production drawings reflecting the communications security interface data were submitted on 6 September 1967. Thus delay in delivery of drawings was attributable to modifications in Army requirements, not to RCA. The delay was necessary in order to assure proper characteristics of the production model.

It is regrettable that military urgency sometimes requires us to begin and to increase production of vital equipment before the widest competition can be obtained. Yet the military requirement was real, was formalized in a memorandum signed by Mr. Vance, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, and could not be ignored. All such requirements are examined carefully to substantiate the urgency of the need. But once the need of our men in the field is clear, the Army always will choose to act at once and save lives, rather than delay in the hope of saving dollars.

Third, you discussed the PRC-77 contracting officer's rejection of a letter offer by Dectron Electronics Corporation of Brooklyn, New York, to produce the PRC-77 at a unit price of \$893.75, or \$43.41 per unit less than the price in the contract awarded RCA.

Dectron's unsolicited letter was not an acceptable proposal. It merely named a price

and requested information on the product to be built. The company had only the most general knowledge of the PRC-77. To build it Decitron would have needed extensive technical data to be obtained from the first production contract, and to wait for them would require slippage in necessary delivery schedules. Without these data, any radio built by Decitron, even if it met most of the general performance standards of the PRC-77, could not be a PRC-77. It would be a new item, with many parts not interchangeable with those of the PRC-77 and probably unable to interface with the amplifier and classified equipment which the PRC-77 uses.

You also referred to two modifications of the second PRC-77 production contract increasing the quantity, while extending the delivery time. Actually, only one of the modifications you mentioned increased the basic contract quantity. This occurred on 31 May for an additional 1298 units at the basic contract price, in order to meet an urgent need for Southeast Asia—priority "06." Deliveries will not stretch out beyond the contract term: the 1298 radios will be delivered by RCA between February 1968 and August 1968 at no increase in unit cost to the Government. The production period of the basic contract is February 1968 through May 1969.

The action on 16 August 1967 was not an increased buy. It was simply the exercise of the second-year part (5400) of the basic two-year contract. The Army awarded a two-year contract in order to obtain a substantially more favorable price per unit on the first-year buy.

You stated that a foreign company is building the PRC-77 with the RCA drawings. I assume you referred to the radio being manufactured by Tadiran, a company in Israel. That firm does not have the PRC-77 drawings, and as far as the Army is aware is building only a PRC-25 with some improvements designed into it by that firm. It is not a PRC-77.

In regard to the PRC-62 radio, award of the contract followed established procedures for research and development awards, as is well documented in the General Accounting Office, report of 13 February 1964 to former Congressman Wilson which you noted. The Army did not imply that ITT, Bendix, Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio. As the GAO report to Congressman Wilson states: "All fifteen proposals received were considered responsive." The award was made to RCA because it submitted the proposal judged most capable of meeting the Army's requirements.

You implied a favoritism by the Army toward RCA, and toward larger contractors in general, which simply does not exist. The Army certainly makes every effort to award contracts to small business, but cannot do so at the sacrifice of meeting military needs. RCA is a highly competent company and has played a major role in development of portable radios over the years. That it obtains some of the Army's electronics contracts can hardly be surprising. But RCA is by no means the Army's major electronics contractor. It received only \$28.5 million out of \$851.1 million total USAECOM awards in FY 1967. Nor does Decitron, the company which attempted to obtain the second PRC-77 production contract, lack military business. On 21 September 1967 the Defense Contract Administration Service advised that Decitron's capacity is so overloaded that a plant survey will have to be conducted before placement of any additional Government contracts with the firm.

Although no names or instances were specified, you implied possible misconduct of Army personnel in award of the PRC-25 and PRC-77 contracts to RCA. I have no reason to entertain such a suspicion and no evidence to support it. However, if any misconduct is revealed by you or by the in-

vestigative agencies now on the scene, I shall of course take prompt action.

Assuring fair, honest and efficient practices in all Army procurement agencies is a responsibility which is taken seriously at all levels of the Army. I should be pleased to discuss the matters covered above, or any others, with you at any time. I believe that in reviewing them you will conclude that the contracting decisions in question were made not only honestly, but wisely and prudently as well.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. RESOR,  
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. DOMINICK. In the first case which I brought up, we were dealing with a new weapon. It was developed, engineered, and carried out by a constituent of mine who produced the first hardware for this weapon, with an open-bore type arrangement that had not yet been produced at the Edgewood Arsenal. As I say, this company is a small firm.

Although it is a small firm, it has fine engineers. It has done defense work, in a minor way, largely subcontracting, in other fields.

The main reason the firm was denied the research and development contract was on the basis of "technical evaluation," as the Army called it.

In one of my speeches I pointed out that the Comptroller General will not exercise any independent determination of the Army's position on technical evaluation. Here is one of the comments that the Secretary made:

Weighting certain factors used in the technical evaluation did not affect Custom's ranking, since no company received a lower score in four of the five characteristics evaluated—technical approach, technical personnel, background experience, and facilities.

If one looks at that in the abstract, it sounds very reasonable—the contract should have been given to Nortronics Divisions of Northrop because it had better facilities and better personnel. But we are dealing with a small company whose people spent over \$100,000 of their own money, and that of their friends, in developing and producing the only hardware that was presented. So the allegation that they did not have the "technical approach, technical background experience, and facilities" to produce the weapon is patent nonsense, in my opinion. Even though the letter is signed by my friend the Secretary of the Army, I am sure he could not have had knowledge of this when he wrote the letter.

It seems impossible for me also to agree with the statement on page 2 of the letter, in which he says:

Custom's proposal simply was not up to the standard required, and the Army would have been wasting money and imperiling the entire development program to award the contract to a company offering so little prospect of success.

This is the very company that initially developed the weapon. This is the very company that fired it. This is the very company that proceeded to have a colored film shown to the Army procurement people, they had the hardware, had the ammunition, had the weapon itself fired in Colorado and at the Edgewood Arsenal.

It is incredible to me that the aids, or

whoever it may have been in the Army, could make that kind of statement, when it was impossible to make it with any degree of accuracy or actuality.

The letter also goes into the question of the RCA contract. I shall have to go into that in more detail at a later date, but I want to say at this time it would seem to me there were certain elements in the RCA contract which could not have been known when I originally gave my speech.

#### RICHARD GARDNER ARTICLE IN AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL MAKES STRONG CASE FOR U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Hon. Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the office of the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, is presently Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia University.

Professor Gardner also serves as a consultant to the U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg at the United Nations. In addition, he recently compiled a most interesting and valuable book entitled "Blueprint for Peace," a composite of the recommendations made by the various committees at the White House Conference on International Cooperation Year in 1965. An earlier book, "In Pursuit of World Order," by Gardner is one of the best books ever written on the United Nations.

Professor Gardner, in the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal, has authored a penetrating and persuasive brief in favor of U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions. This article, aptly titled "A Costly Anachronism," points out the company this country is keeping by our continuing failure to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions, as well as presenting a strong case for U.S. participation.

Because of Professor Gardner's exceptional eminence in both legal and diplomatic fields, and because I believe this article constitutes a major contribution to our dialog on human rights, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Costly Anachronism" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### A COSTLY ANACHRONISM

(By Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses, Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University)

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations, responding to American initiative and American leadership, approved overwhelmingly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Only a few countries abstained—the Communist bloc, Saudi Arabia and the Union of South Africa.

Today, less than two decades later, only three of the original fifty-one U.N. members have failed to ratify any U.N. conventions embodying the basic principles included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These three are Spain, the Union of South Africa—and the United States.

To be sure, the United States has demonstrated its concern with the promotion of



human rights in ways other than through adherence to human rights conventions. We have advanced proposals for strengthening U.N. procedures in this field. We have spoken out clearly against specific violations of human rights in different parts of the world. And, most important of all, we have earned widespread respect from the members of the United Nations for the dedicated manner in which we have set about eradicating discrimination and injustice in our own society.

Nevertheless, our inclusion in the small company of U.N. members who have refused to ratify any human rights treaties has become an increasing diplomatic embarrassment. Our friends cannot understand it. Our adversaries exploit it. It is a costly anachronism which should be eliminated without delay.

As a representative of the United States at numerous international conferences during the last few years, I must admit that I was unable to find a convincing answer to the simple question: "Why is the United States unwilling to make an international commitment against human slavery?"

A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently completed hearings on three U.N. human rights conventions sent to the Senate in 1963 by President John F. Kennedy—the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor and the Political Rights of Women. It is to be hoped that the Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of these instruments without delay—and that it will then give sympathetic consideration to the Genocide Convention, pending in the Senate since 1949.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS BASED ON NATIONAL TRADITIONS

Does it really make any difference whether the United States ratifies these instruments? I believe that it does. We have an interest in the international promotion of human rights which springs from our most basic national traditions. Since the Declaration of Independence, the United States has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and freedoms, not just for Americans, but for "all men". Thomas Jefferson expressed a deep faith of the founding fathers when he predicted that from American shores the "fire of freedom and human rights" would be "lighted up in other regions of the earth". Throughout American history, and still today, the world looks upon us not merely as an arsenal of weapons or a storehouse of commodities but as a society committed to the promotion of the dignity of man.

Our support for human rights is, therefore, an essential and irreversible part of our American tradition. It is also more than that. It is a basic ingredient of our position as a world power. The vitality of our society and its international influence are both affected by our success in promoting the basic values of human dignity at home and abroad. In these days, foreign policy inevitably has a moral dimension.

By our leadership in international efforts on behalf of human rights we can clarify the fundamental issues that agitate the world today. Some countries put human freedoms very low on their scale of priorities; they are prepared to violate them in their drive for world power or rapid economic growth. It is the belief in human rights, in the importance and worth of every individual, that distinguishes us from totalitarians of the left and of the right.

Peace and security, economic and social development and human rights are the three sides of the triangle of world order. In the absence of any one of them, the triangle is incomplete. We have learned from hard experience of the intimate interdependence between human rights and peace and security. Nazi Germany should have taught everyone the lesson that internal suppression is often the handmaiden of external aggression—that the destruction of free-

dom at home can quickly lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Dictators typically employ foreign adventures to solidify their domestic power; and the recklessness of their foreign policy is directly facilitated by the systematic destruction of domestic dissent. The other side of the coin is no less true: The more a country is threatened from without, the more dangerous it is for human rights within.

Therefore, those concerned with the preservation and development of human rights in free societies cannot fail to be concerned with the promotion of human rights on a world-wide basis. The same is true for those concerned with the pursuit of peace and security. World-wide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms will also be progress in creating a peaceful and stable world order. As President Kennedy put it at American University, peace is "in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights".

United States adherence to the three conventions now under study by the Foreign Relations Committee can make a practical contribution to the basic national interest of our country in promoting human rights around the world.

The Supplementary Convention on Slavery, thus far ratified by sixty-seven countries, supplements the 1926 Slavery Convention, to which the United States is already a party, by dealing with conditions akin to slavery. It requires contracting parties to take all practicable and necessary measures to bring about as soon as possible the complete abolition of such practices as debt bondage serfdom, involuntary marriage or transfer of women for payment, transfer of widows as inherited property and exploitation of children.

The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, already ratified by seventy-five countries, pledges each contracting party to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labor—as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing political views ideologically opposed to the established system; as a method of mobilizing and using labor for purposes of economic development; as a means of labor discipline; as a punishment to those having participated in strikes; or as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination.

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, ratified by fifty countries, provides that women be entitled to vote in all elections on equal terms with men and without discrimination; that they be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law; and that they be entitled to hold public office and to exercise all public functions established by national law.

These basic rights have long been taken for granted in our own country. But they are not taken for granted everywhere. Indeed, they are very much at issue in many countries of the world. By adhering to these conventions, we help give international effect to fundamental rights we have long enjoyed at home.

#### POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF U.S. ADHERENCE

Nobody, of course, believes that words on paper are enough in themselves. Nobody thinks that signing a human rights convention brings automatic improvement in the condition of people around the world. The positive consequences of United States adherence are hard to measure. Nevertheless, they are very real:

1. Ratification by the United States will encourage other nations to adhere to these conventions and implement their provisions in their own territories. This is particularly true of newly independent countries that frequently take U. N. conventions as a model. Ambassador Goldberg, in his testimony before the subcommittee, put this

point sharply: "Without the support of the United States, these agreements may appear insignificant to many other countries. If we do not consider it important to sign the conventions, why should they? Or, more important, why should they implement the conventions?"

2. Ratification will put the United States in a better legal and moral position to protest infringement of these human rights in countries that have ratified the conventions but failed to implement them in practice.

3. Ratification will increase United States influence in the continuing U.N. process of drafting legal norms in the field of human rights. As long as the United States fails to ratify any human rights conventions, its views will carry less weight than they deserve.

4. Ratification will dissipate the embarrassing contradiction between our failure to ratify these conventions and our traditional support of the basic human rights with which they are concerned.

The predicament in which our failure to ratify these conventions has placed United States representatives in the United Nations is obvious. Consider, as an example, the following summary record of the attack launched by the Soviet delegate last year upon Morris Abram, our distinguished representative in the Human Rights Commission:

"An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multi-lateral international conventions in the field of human rights drawn up under the auspices of the U.N. and its Specialized Agencies. The U.S. representative had admitted that the U.S. had lagged in that sphere. That was an understatement; he would mention some of the conventions which the U.S. had not ratified."

The Soviet delegate proceeded to cite examples, emphasizing the conventions which are the subject of these hearings. The Soviet statement, of course, was hypocritical in the extreme. Mr. Abram quickly pointed out, for example, that while the United States had not, like the Soviet Union, ratified the Genocide Convention, no one had accused our country of the Katyn Forest Massacres. Mr. Abram's answer was effective, yet the question persisted in the minds of many friendly delegates: If the United States is really against such practices, why is it not prepared to commit itself to United Nations treaties outlawing them?

#### ARGUMENTS AGAINST U.S. ADHERENCE

Thus the arguments in favor of ratifying these conventions are substantial. At the same time, there are no convincing reasons of law or policy which should prevent us from ratifying them. A study of the literature on the subject of human rights conventions reveals several arguments which have been used against United States adherence.

One argument is that ratification of human rights conventions would alter in undesirable ways the laws of the United States. This argument is inapplicable to the conventions before us today since they would involve no changes in American law.

Another argument is that ratification of human rights conventions would move into the federal domain certain subjects hitherto reserved for state action. This argument is also inapplicable to the three conventions before us today since all of them deal with matters which the Constitution has already placed within the federal domain.

I hasten to add, although it is not directly relevant to the conventions before us,

that a human rights convention should not be rejected by the United States simply because it deals with matters hitherto reserved to the states. In *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), the Supreme Court decided that the Constitution authorizes Congress to pass legislation in implementation of valid treaty commitments on certain matters otherwise reserved to the states. From the point of view of policy, there would appear to be no reason to refuse to adhere to a human rights convention dealing with matters hitherto reserved to state jurisdiction—the Genocide Convention and the Marriage Convention are examples—unless the disadvantages of moving such matters into the federal domain outweigh our foreign policy interest in the conventions.

The third argument employed against ratification of human rights conventions is that they are not proper subjects for the exercise of the treaty-making power.

Some members of the American Bar Association have argued that the United States cannot under its Constitution enter into human rights treaties because they deal "entirely with domestic matters, i.e., with the relation between a state and its own citizens." This proposition has no basis whatsoever in United States law or treaty practice. The relevant test laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States is whether a treaty deals with a matter "which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country" (*Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U.S. 258, 267 (1890)). Charles Evans Hughes laid down a similar standard when he declared that the treaty power can be used only to deal with matters of "international concern."

It is obvious that many matters involving the relations between a government and its own citizens can be of sufficient "international concern" to be included in treaties between the United States and other countries. The 1926 Slavery Convention, ratified by the United States during the Hoover Administration, commits the parties to abolish slavery within their respective jurisdictions and also to take measures to prevent forced labor within their jurisdictions from developing into conditions analogous to slavery. Surely things which were within the treaty power forty years ago cannot be outside the treaty power today. Moreover, the United Nations Charter, itself a treaty obligation of the United States, commits us to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the organization to promote human rights for people within the United States as well as overseas.

There are many other conventions to which we are a party committing the United States to regulate the activities of American citizens within this country for many purposes not relating to human rights—to control the production and international traffic of certain drugs, to obtain statistics on causes of death, to prescribe rules of the road and to preserve wildlife. If the United States Government can enter into a valid treaty commitment to restrain American citizens within this country from shooting animals, it is difficult to see why the United States Government cannot enter into a treaty commitment to restrain American citizens within this country from enslaving other Americans. I know of no constitutional provision which suggests or implies that animals are more important than people.

Clearly, if slavery, forced labor and the denial of women's basic rights are of "international concern" in the year 1967—and the testimony at recent hearings before a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee was unanimous that they are—there is no legal impediment to ratification of the treaties. Quite apart from the general interrelation between the denial of basic human rights and United States foreign policy interests, there are special reasons why these three conven-

tions are of international concern for our country.

#### PRACTICAL REASONS FOR INTERNATIONAL CONCERN

Slavery and forced labor practiced abroad, in addition to breeding political and social tensions, can have a direct impact on the sales of American products in the United States and foreign markets.

The denial of basic rights to women, by affecting adversely one half the human resources of a less developed country, constitutes a major obstacle to progress in less developed countries that receive quantities of American aid. To give a very specific example: family planning programs, the essential means of de-fusing the population explosion, will never be wholly successful until women come to enjoy their political and social rights and cease being regarded as household possessions.

Those who oppose United States adherence to any U.N. human rights conventions have often cited the 1953 statement of John Foster Dulles to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Dulles, then Secretary of State, said: "We do not ourselves look upon a treaty as the means which we would now select as the proper and most effective way to spread throughout the world the goals of human liberty to which this Nation has been dedicated since its inception."

Mr. Dulles's use of the word "now"—and the fact that this statement was motivated by the desire to discourage the then active Bricker Amendment—suggests that Mr. Dulles's statement was a statement of policy rather than law, and that it does not preclude a different approach in the present situation. Moreover, Mr. Dulles was previously on record as a private citizen in support of the Genocide Convention, and as a United States Delegate in the United Nations he expressed support for human rights conventions.

Finally, it could hardly be maintained even in 1953 that human rights conventions were not proper subjects for the exercise of the treaty-making power. The United States was party to treaties regulating the slave trade during the nineteenth century and ratified the 1926 League of Nations Convention outlawing slavery—the predecessor of the treaty now under discussion here. If the outlawing of slavery can be the proper subject for treaty making, why not the outlawing of forced labor? And why not the denial of basic rights to women at a time when human dignity and a maximum use of a nation's resources are so obviously a matter of international concern?

Mr. Dulles also declared: "I do not mean to imply that the boundary between international and domestic concerns is rigid and fixed for all time." Indeed, it is not. The treaty-making power is broad enough to encompass all matters of international concern as determined by contemporary fact, rather than by the outmoded conceptions of a distant past.

"I am not an advocate of frequent changes in laws and constitutions," Jefferson once wrote. "But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed and more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions changed with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

There are many urgent questions at present before the Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Congress. In particular, Congress is preoccupied with the war in Vietnam and all the problems it poses for our country. But foreign policy has many dimensions. We must not permit our preoccupation with one dimension to divert us from others which are also important.

There is a moral dimension to our foreign

policy. Cynics deny it until they are obliged to recognize its effect upon our power. Our concern with human rights is not just altruism—in the long run, it is essential to our national security. At a time when we are discharging at great cost a commitment to human freedom in Vietnam, we should also discharge our unfinished business in the world-wide promotion of human rights.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### UNITED STATES BECOMING FOSTER PARENT FOR ALL OF ASIA, IN RUSK'S VIEW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the press conference which Secretary Rusk held on Thursday, October 12, was enlightening. His presentation—I wish I could say testimony—may serve to focus attention on the vital Vietnam issues that confront the American people.

So that part of the record will be clear, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of these remarks the press conference of October 12, 1967, by Secretary Rusk on the subject of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Before discussing the substance of the press conference, I comment briefly on the apparent unwillingness of the Secretary of State to meet in public session with appropriate congressional committees to discuss the war in Vietnam.

A fundamental constitutional issue is involved here.

In terms of our British antecedents, the issue is whether the Cabinet ministers of the King—or President—are immune from legislative process.

Could the Committee on Foreign Relations, for example, compel the Secretary of State to appear before it in public session to testify either in connection with legislation, or in connection with the more general function of advice and consent?

This issue has never been fully resolved, although it seems clear that the President could order his Cabinet minister not to appear on grounds that such appearance would not, in the President's view, be in the public interest. It is unlikely that any congressional committee would be so insistent on the exercise of a legislative function, however, that it would push the power of subpoena to the point where it could be tested by the courts—as would be the case if a min-



ister of the President were sought to be jailed for contempt.

I advocate no such course.

There are other devices which the Founding Fathers built into our system of checks and balances. Congress could, for example, refuse to appropriate funds, or the Senate could refuse to act on nominations, or other harassing tactics could be used designed to compel a Cabinet minister in public session to testify in response to the queries of Members of Congress.

I do not advocate such courses of action.

My sole purpose in making these few introductory comments is to be sure that as a U.S. Senator I have not, by failing to note Secretary Rusk's unwillingness to debate these issues with Members of Congress in public session, contributed to establishing a precedent that Cabinet members are immune from such appearances. It is my personal view that the administration—and specifically the Secretaries of State and Defense—should be willing, indeed, eager to test their policies and policy objectives in the forum of public debate and within the bounds of the American Constitution.

Last evening, at the University of Notre Dame, in my State of Indiana, where I was to address an audience of students, just before I made my remarks it was announced that the Secretary of Defense intended to appear before the same group, and would submit himself to questions from the audience.

I stated last night, and state again now, that it is remarkable to me that the Secretary of Defense finds it possible to submit himself to the students of Notre Dame University, but finds it impossible to submit himself to the U.S. Senate and the duly elected members of the Senate committees.

It is not enough for a Cabinet member to be willing to expose himself to the klieg lights only under circumstances which he can control. As the Secretary of State remarked last Thursday:

I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits.

But the point is the American system of free debate and discussion requires, as I believe Mr. Justice Holmes suggested, that ideas be tested in the marketplace—not that they be handed down by a King, a President, or a Secretary of State as if they had been thereby inscribed in granite.

Let us assume, however, that the Secretary of State will continue unwilling to engage publicly in discussion with his elected foreign policy critics. Under these circumstances we must do the best we can. That to me means that if we are to permit the Secretary to dodge his critics, if he is permitted to rely on defending his policies on grounds of his own choice, then we have a duty at least to propound the kinds of questions he should be willing to discuss with the people and their representatives.

Incidentally, the fact Secretary Rusk held a conference—even that substitute for discussion—was probably provoked by criticism apparent in congressional debate, public opinion polls, press dis-

patches from Vietnam, and by perceptive and troubled columnists and editorial writers.

One final point before commenting on a few of the specifics of the Secretary's press conference:

American involvement in Vietnam and what we do about it has now reached the point where our American policy must be determined largely by the exercise of good judgment. Where American policy in Vietnam goes from here cannot be justified on the basis of implications that there exists a body of "facts" to which the administration is privy, but of which the public is not aware.

We are dealing with big issues upon which there are no pat answers.

The President and his Joint Chiefs of Staff do not know what, if anything, will trigger the other side to call for Chinese or Russian Volunteers. Secretary Rusk did not know what would bring China into Korea in 1951, as is shown by the record, and he does not know today the threshold beyond which we cannot go without bringing on world war III.

The administration does not know the point beyond which the American public will not support them.

The Joint Chiefs and the President do not know whether a little more bombing will bring the other side to negotiations, or whether the North Vietnamese have the same staying power as Texans at the Alamo.

They do not know who will be in charge in South Vietnam in 6 months.

They do not know how many Americans will be needed in South Vietnam to pacify that country.

They do not know what to do to get additional contributions either from allies already in Vietnam or how to get help from NATO countries, or India or Indonesia, or Japan—all of which, according to Mr. Rusk, are threatened.

In short, the judgment of any reasonably interested and knowledgeable American citizen is as good on this kind of issue as the judgment of the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff—a number of whose ex-members, I might note, disagree seriously with the present members of the Joint Chiefs.

What we do know very definitely and certainly is that our American system is based on the proposition that the judgment of the American people on issues like these is more likely to be right than the judgment of any specialist—be he President, the world's greatest jet ace, or an authority on enzymes.

I turn now to the statement of the Secretary of State last Thursday as he met with the press.

Not having had opportunity to question the Secretary, I hope I do him no injustice in my interpretation of the main points in his press conference.

The Secretary's principal emphasis was upon his conclusion that American security—using his term—is at stake in Vietnam because "within the next decade or two, these will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be." Although we have not "nominated ourselves to be the policemen of all Asia," said the Secretary, "we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the free nations of Asia to live in peace."

Therefore, as a "Pacific" power he contends that we have formed alliances and have "accepted a share in their defense as part of the vital national interest of the United States."

The Secretary stated:

The almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

What Secretary Rusk concludes from this summary of his statement is that the United States must use its tremendous power to provide a shield until such time as "the free nations of Asia brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with cooperation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent."

This is necessary—

Says Secretary Rusk—

if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years.

I hope I have done Secretary Rusk justice. I hope I have quoted him accurately. I have quoted him as much as possible. I believe the foregoing is a fair statement of his message which, if I may summarize it in my words, is as follows:

Asian Communist imperialism, represented by 1 billion Chinese, will be able within the next few years, and with nuclear weapons, to threaten to impose communism on 1 billion free Asians. The Communists will be likely to succeed in this venture unless the United States assists the free nations of Asia by supplying American manpower and material and equating stability and progress in these nations with the national security of the United States.

The objective of Asian communism—

Says Secretary Rusk—

is to cut the world in two and as long as that is the objective, the "hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia . . . will be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking . . . their future . . . circumscribed by fear."

As Vice President HUMPHREY amplified this new theme a few days later, October 15, Doylestown, Pa.:

Imagine what kind of world we would be living in if the sweep of Asian Communism should include all of Southeast Asia with its millions of people and its vast resources. The entire power structure of the world would be destroyed and drastically changed.

If this be the true reflection of the American basic objectives in Asia, I would have liked to ask Secretary Rusk and the administration such questions as the following:

First, if free Asia is threatened by Asian communism as suggested, then why is it that the most populous nations which are so threatened are not helping the United States in Vietnam with men and materiel? Specifically, why do not Japan, Indonesia, and India not see the threat in Secretary Rusk's terms? Do not those three nations combined have more industry, more raw material, and more manpower than exists in all of mainland China?

Second, is it not true that the United States is paying directly, or indirectly,

the full costs of the troops of Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines who are with us in Vietnam? Would they be willing to help us without subsidy?

Third, why is it that most of our NATO allies do not see the threat in the Secretary's terms? Does the United States have a particular clairvoyance on this subject?

Fourth, do a majority of the members of the United Nations agree with the conclusion of the Secretary that "one of the most important historical facts in this postwar period has been that the almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing the peace in the world"? Does not the United Nations have a role in organizing the peace? Or, has the United States preempted the world quest for peace?

Fifth, how many troops does mainland China now have stationed outside her borders? Is that more or less than the number of Americans stationed in Asia? Does this disposition of troops suggest to the world community that Chinese communism is on the march?

Finally on this point, but not in the nature of a question, I suggest that a candid statement of the Secretary's conclusion is that American boys must bear the brunt of the attacks of Asian communism on the free nations of Asia until they are ready to do so themselves. This conclusion is deficient in two fundamental respects.

First, the Secretary assumes that if American boys and American materiel will supply a shield, the free nations of Asia, will "brace themselves, get themselves set" and then create "secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own."

That assumption simply does not accord with either the nature of human beings or the nature of society. American citizens need only to consult their own judgment to assess the validity of that assumption. Why should any Asian state worry about protecting itself if the Americans will do it for them?

A shield of American boys will not encourage the Japanese, Indonesians, or the Indians to fight their own battles any more than the shield of American boys in Vietnam has induced the South Vietnamese to build up their own forces or develop their own institutions.

The best way to build indigenous free Asian defenses is to let these states see their own freedom threatened—not for the United States to lecture them. The fact that both India and Indonesia have asked the United States to stop the bombing and that the Japanese Government stands quiet in embarrassed silence suggests our lectures, pleas, and military action are not in their view in defense of freedom or assurance of peace.

The second fundamental deficiency in Secretary Rusk's conclusion that Americans must protect free nations of Asia from Asian communism is that he assumes the more Americans are ready to do the job, the more we will be respected.

Again, I suggest this does not accord with human nature, or the facts.

Is it reasonable to expect that somehow, after Asians kicked out the coloni-

alists—French, British, and Dutch—that now they are going to be anxious to embrace Americans?

I think not.

It is this kind of judgment that any American citizen can make by consulting his own conscience.

Mr. President, Secretary Rusk spoke of the "importance of precision" in our discussions of Vietnam.

I suggest the Secretary was somewhat imprecise himself when he said that "the debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail."

This is rather imprecise. We are debating the role of the United States in the world and we are not agreed what that role should be. He unfortunately assumes that his view of the U.S. role is the correct view.

Is this Nation torn as it is today by discussion over "detail"? I think not.

As for imprecision, it seems to me that word characterizes very well one of the things that is wrong with our policies toward Vietnam. At one time or another the American people have been told that we are in Vietnam because we must honor our commitments, that we are fighting there for the principle of self-determination, that if we do not fight in Vietnam we would have to fight on the Pacific coast, that we are fighting to stop aggression, that we are there because the United Nations is ineffective, and now we are told that we are in Asia to prevent Asian communism from cutting the world in two.

We are warned that we must not be imprecise. Are we children?

This imprecision goes also to lesser matters, hardly worth mentioning except to warn that everything said or written by administration spokesmen should be taken with a grain of salt.

For example, in the press conference of October 12, Secretary Rusk said:

We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings.

But at an earlier conference on February 9 of this year, Mr. Rusk said:

We have on two occasions stopped the bombing of North Vietnam to discover whether there might be some constructive reaction from the other side.

We were then in the midst of the short "Tet" pause in bombing.

This discrepancy seems to me rather imprecise—especially in view of the fact that, since Tet, there has been only one further bombing pause, on May 23, Buddha's birthday.

Mr. Rusk made a great deal of the point that the United States is responding to its commitment under the SEATO Treaty. But as late as March 8, 1965, a State Department official paper describing the legal basis for U.S. actions against North Vietnam failed even to mention the SEATO Treaty. And on August 1, 1964, when Senator Ervin asked the Secretary of State—during the hearings on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—whether we were assisting South Vietnam under the obligations of the SEATO Treaty, the Secretary replied:

We do believe that the obligations of the SEATO Treaty are both joint and several, and that the SEATO Treaty is a substantiating basis for our presence there and our effort

there although, however, we are not acting specifically under the SEATO Treaty.

The Secretary also stated at his conference on October 12, that "five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and Vietnamese troops." But he failed to note that the most powerful members of SEATO are not with us—namely, France, Great Britain, and Pakistan. He also failed to note that the United States has as many troops in South Korea as there are South Koreans in Vietnam—all of whom, of course, are paid by the United States.

The Secretary also stated that the "proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea." But he failed to note the key fact, that in Korea the South Koreans supplied two-thirds of the frontline troops, whereas in Vietnam, the United States is doing most of the fighting, and the South Vietnamese forces are engaged in garrison duty.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I commend the Secretary's press conference of October 12 to the most careful study—word by word. Imprecise as it is, it is the most precise statement of the role which the Secretary envisages for the United States in this world.

We are the world's greatest power. No doubt of it.

This administration plans to use that power to save Asia from communism, even if we must do so virtually single-handed—as seems likely—and without regard to the cost of our domestic society. We stand ready to save a billion free Asians from a threat most of them do not feel.

This is a crusade we had better not embark upon—certainly not until a consensus has developed which is much larger than now exists in the country.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 13, 1967]

RUSK: "CENTRAL OBJECTIVE IS A . . . RELIABLE PEACE"

(The text of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference yesterday.)

Secretary RUSK: I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Vietnam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (a) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (b) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (c) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO Treaty approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger . . ."

The Treaty says "each party" will act. The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five



signatories have engaged their forces along-side Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea.

In August, 1964, the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia." This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO Treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, and in Asia where two-thirds of the world's people live, no less vital to us as a Nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this Nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great Nation. The present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our overriding object is—and must be in this modern world—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southeast Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Vietnam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate above detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our Marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically re-

jects any such notion. When people say "Negotiate now," they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other chiefs of state concerned tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Vietnam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of governments have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Vietnam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

I am ready for your questions.

Q: Mr. Secretary, with regard specifically to President Thieu's offer, reported offer to meet with Hanoi and then arrange a week's pause in bombing if they agreed to talks, one was the United States consulted on this offer first, and did it agree, and, two, do you think such a limited offer has any chance of success?

A: My understanding is that a press officer repeated what President-elect Thieu had said during his campaign, I think in August. And that this was not itself a new development. Of course, we would be very much interested in Hanoi's response to such a suggestion.

The problem is that dozens and dozens of suggestions have been made to Hanoi through all sorts of channels, with all sorts of formula, and that Hanoi has categorically rejected all of them.

Now, this is the sort of an idea which is no problem for Washington. What is needed is some response from Hanoi to this or any one of a dozen other ideas with which Hanoi is thoroughly familiar.

Q: Mr. Secretary, some question has arisen in connection with the report from Saigon today as to whether the United States was consulted about President Thieu's proposed move, and how President Thieu can make a bombing offer when he is not doing the bombing.

A: Oh, I think there is no problem between ourselves and the government of South Vietnam on that. We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings. Everything turns on what Hanoi's attitude is. We and the government of South Vietnam keep in close touch on these matters, but the answer does not come just from Saigon and Washington. The answer must come from Hanoi as well.

#### SIGN FROM HANOI

Q: Mr. Secretary, you talked in your statement about the importance of precision, and with that in mind, sir, I wonder if you could help us understand whether the United States now still requires a military sign of deescalation from Hanoi in exchange for cessation of the bombing, or whether the President's statement about assuming Hanoi will not take advantage of a bombing pause represents a change.

A: Well, I think we ought to be clear that as far as the United States is concerned, we would engage in negotiations without any conditions whatever at the earliest possible moment. I frequently said we will do that today.

Now, the other side has raised a major condition. That condition is a permanent and

unconditional cessation of the bombing. And they have also indicated that they will take no corresponding military action on their side but would expect to go ahead with their part of the war with complete intensity, with all of the effort that they can mobilize.

Now, President Johnson in San Antonio stated an assumption. This is an assumption with respect to the condition imposed by Hanoi. The assumption would be that if we stopped the bombing there would not be military advantage taken by that cessation of the bombing by Hanoi.

Now, Hanoi knows what this means, and we have had not the slightest indication that Hanoi is prepared for those prompt and productive talks to which the President alluded in his San Antonio reference.

#### ENCOURAGEMENT

Q: Mr. Secretary, you said you were encouraged about the prospects of peace in Vietnam. Why are you encouraged in view of the lack of reaction from Hanoi?

A: Well, there are many things. I know that some reporter in Saigon invented the word "stalemate." Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate. We see defections from the Vietcong double what they were last year. We see the recruitment of southerners to the Vietcong dropped by approximately a half. We see desertions from the South Vietnamese forces sharply reduced over last year.

You have heard Gen. Larsen's report on what is happening in the II Corps area, which is half the land area of South Vietnam, the opening up of roads, the opening up of railways, the areas under government control, the sharp reduction of areas under Vietcong control. There are many indicators that the government and Allied forces are getting on with the job on the military side.

Beyond that, despite all the tongues-in-cheek, despite all the skepticism, the South Vietnamese have come through with what really ought to be considered almost a miracle in politics.

In the midst of a dirty, tough, mean, guerrilla war, they have elected a Constituent Assembly; they have adopted a Constitution; they have had hamlet and village elections throughout the country; they have elected a President and a Vice President and a Senate; they will shortly elect a lower house of the Legislature, in a situation where the Vietcong in most areas has said, if you vote, you die, and they are getting on with it.

Now, it is not easy, and we can sit back here comfortably and be skeptical about details, worry about this or that particular point, but the overriding fact is that in the midst of this kind of struggle, the South Vietnamese have been moving steadily toward a constitutional system.

Now, these elections were held in areas representing some 75 per cent of the population. A very high percentage of those who registered voted favorably, compared with our own elections in this country. The economic situation has been improving. In other words, the Vietcong have not achieved their objective. The country is moving ahead. And I see no reason for us to be gloomy simply because it is not over yet. We have had our combat forces there for approximately two years, and other Allies have put forces in there, and the situation is moving.

Now, one can find individual incidents here and there that would throw doubt on it, and the skeptic can always find some basis for his story, but there are at least a thousand stories a day that could be filed from Saigon, many of them of success, many of them reflecting close cooperation, friendship and acts of kindness among South Vietnamese and Americans.

When you look at the total situation it's moving, and I have no reason myself whatever to subscribe to this notion of a stalemate. It is not a stalemate at all.

## SOVIET MOTIVE

Q: Mr. Secretary, what is the motive of the Soviet government to reject the reconvening of the Geneva conference? Did you explore this with Mr. Gromyko in New York?

A: I find it difficult to get into motives. I would suppose that Hanoi categorically refuses a Geneva conference, and therefore the Soviet Union is unwilling to step out in front and join with the British Cochairman to convene a conference to which Hanoi and Peking both strenuously object. We ourselves will be very glad to have such a conference convened, about Vietnam, about Laos, about Cambodia, or about any subject related to Southeast Asia.

A Senator the other day in the course of a Senate debate was asked what his alternative was for Vietnam, and he said, "well, I would like to see a Geneva conference." Well, he is not arguing with Washington. We have tried over and over again to use the Geneva machinery for the purposes for which it was established. We will be glad to see the two cochairmen say, go to Geneva, and put themselves in touch with elements or parties in the dispute. We would be glad to have the three ICC countries do the same thing or to make arrangements for the demilitarization of the DMZ or to assure Prince Sihanouk that Cambodia's neutrality will not be abused.

So there is no problem with us on that. The problem is that Hanoi says "no".

## SHIFT OF TALKS

Q: Mr. Secretary, what do you think of the thesis of turning negotiations upside down and beginning instead between Washington and Hanoi at some lower level within the countries, specifically between the government of Saigon and the NLF, or elements of it?

A: Well, we, as you know, draw no major distinction between what is called the NLF and Hanoi. I think that the United States view is affected by the fact that as far as peace is concerned, our problem is with Hanoi. We did not put our combat forces into South Vietnam because of dissident elements in South Vietnam. We put our combat forces in there because North Vietnamese forces moved into South Vietnam. So that our problem of peace is with Hanoi.

Further than that, we know from captured documents, testimony of prisoners and other sources of information that the NLF is directed from Hanoi on a daily basis.

Now, we have no objections to exploring the possibilities of contacts with the NLF, nor do we have any objections to the government in Saigon doing so. But I would not want to mislead you by thinking that in my judgment that is going to solve the problem of North Vietnamese regiments in South Vietnam for the purpose of imposing a solution on that country by force. Hanoi has a major role to play in peace in this situation, and until there is some indication from Hanoi that they are prepared to make peace, then I don't think that lesser formulae are likely to solve the problem.

## DEVELOPMENTS IN 1967

Q: Mr. Secretary, on the same day the Russians ratified the Outer Space Treaty and announced their biggest ever rise in their arms budget. Would you please appraise the relative weight of these two events in U.S.-Soviet relations?

A: Well, as far as the arms budget is concerned, I believe that the defense budget as they announced it is about the same proportion of their new budget as it was in the previous budget. In any event, it indicates some increase. Just what direction that increase will take we have no way of knowing. There was some indication that it related to the need for more military assistance to other countries. And we know that they are increasing their military assistance to North Vietnam. But it is true that we signed the Space Treaty, and I think it is worth pausing to reflect a little on 1967 despite Vietnam.

It turns out to be a most constructive year. The Kennedy Round negotiations were successfully concluded. The International Monetary Fund took a major step in the field of international liquidity. The Space Treaty was ratified unanimously by our Senate. We concluded the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union. We and the Soviet Union filed a joint draft of a nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. The Presidents of the Western Hemisphere decided to go for a Latin American Common Market in this next decade. The Asian Development Bank became a going institution this year. Even though there was a distressing and sharp war in the Middle East, the fighting was ended in four days without the intervention of the great powers.

In other words, there have been some very constructive developments this year looking toward a general peace and a general solution of problems despite the pain and the tragedy of Vietnam. We should not be negligent of those important developments.

## FULBRIGHT VIEW

Q: Mr. Secretary, in a speech in the Senate yesterday, Sen. Fulbright asserted that the United Nations is being deterred from action concerning Vietnam more by the failure of the United States to encourage it to act than by the opposition of the Soviet Union. What are your views on that, sir, and what role do you think the United Nations can play?

A: Well, I don't have his statement in front of me. I—relying upon the way you stated it—

Q: Would you like for me to get it verbatim?

A:—would say that it is not true. The United States would be glad to have the United Nations take up this question and deal with it responsibly. We have pending in the Security Council a resolution which the Security Council does not wish to act upon.

I think the general attitude in the United Nations seems to be that since Hanoi and Peking and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

Now, I have said many times that we ourselves do not share this view because we believe that the United Nations has a responsibility for general peace and security in the world and we'd be glad to see them take it up. But, on the other hand, there are some problems about going through an exercise of futility, if that is what it appears to be, to satisfy some critics among our own people.

We can't say to you that a resolution will come out of the Security Council because of the Soviet veto, and the Soviets have made it perfectly clear they will veto. And we have no reason to think that the General Assembly will address itself in this matter in the same way in which the U.N. is addressing itself to the Middle East. In the case of the Middle East, they have had a long association with these problems. They played the crucial role in establishing the state of Israel. They have had peacekeeping forces out there and they have had armistice machinery out there, and this matter has been before the United Nations year after year. They have the United Nations machinery for refugees in the area, but this is not the attitude in the United Nations about South Vietnam. I think that they are somehow hoping that other means and other procedures will find the key that will unlock this problem, when they are on notice by most of the parties concerned—that the United Nations will not be permitted to find that key and not be permitted by Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.

## INTELLECTUALS

Q: Mr. Secretary, may I ask, in view of a widely published report, whether in your nonpublic appearances around the country

you are denouncing the intellectual critics of the war, including Arthur Schlesinger, and whether as reported you have dismissed Roger Hillsman.

A: No, I am not going to comment on third-hand reports on what I was alleged to have said in a private meeting. These things get out of context very quickly.

It is not true that I have any generic attitude toward all those people who call themselves or are called intellectuals.

I've been around them a good deal in my time.

I do recall, once in a while—perhaps you will forgive me for this—as friends used to say of Einstein—that he was a genius in mathematical physics, an amateur in music, and a baby in politics.

Now, I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits and the fact that a man knows everything there is to know about enzymes doesn't mean that he knows very much about Vietnam or how to organize a peace or the life and death of nations.

So, I have great respect for intellectuals, but I don't feel that I'm intimidated by them.

(Laughter.)

## PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Q: Mr. Secretary, you said in your opening statement that essentially we are engaged in a debate about detail, but the record would indicate that there has been increasing defection in the ranks of Administration supporters in the Congress. Do you contemplate, sir, a further sequence of public appearances in the Congress to try to clarify, amplify this position?

A: Well, I'm not sure that as far as the Congress is concerned the way to clarify and achieve accord is through public appearances. I myself greatly enjoy serious, responsible, candid consultation with the great committees of Congress in circumstances in which such discourse can take place. I do not think such discourse can take place always in open session.

As far as I'm concerned, a public hearing has some of the same problems as does a press conference. There are very few secrets, if Americans can discuss these matters among themselves without the rest of the world listening in. But when our allies in the non-aligned world and the Communists are listening in, there are some inhibitions at least upon the Secretary of State, because what I say in my official capacity does have repercussions in other places.

Now, these repercussions don't occur when there can be private consultations in executive sessions.

Now, that doesn't mean that I'm opposed to public discussion. I have taken part in a good many of them and made a good many public appearances in the Congress. But in terms of exercising the great constitutional responsibilities of the President and of the Congress in the national interest, I think myself that close consultation behind closed doors is one of the better ways to do it.

We do have men engaged in combat. We do have some very serious and delicate problems in front of us. And these are not problems that can always be fully explored or resolved with the klieg lights and the rest of the world all looking on and listening in.

## BOMBING HALT

Q: Mr. Secretary, I'm not clear yet on your explanation of the President's statement in San Antonio. Is that intended to modify, reduce, or leave ambiguous our terms, our conditions for a bombing pause in North Vietnam?

A: Well, I think we ought to just read the statement for what it says and reflect upon the absence of a response from Hanoi.

Now, you may wonder about the details of this expression that they will not take advantage of a bombing halt. There's no point, as I have said before in these confer-



ences, no point in my negotiating the details of that with you because you can't stop the bombing. We are prepared to discuss the details of that with Hanoi. They know it—they know it. But the point I was making is this: It seems to me that this is an essentially reasonable and fair proposal for anyone who is interested in peace. And it seems to me that it is hard for anyone to reject this proposal without confessing at the same time that they are not interested in peace and that they propose to continue their effort to move in on Southeast Asia.

This is not, by the way, just a question of Vietnam. I have never subscribed to the domino theory; it's much too esoteric. There are North Vietnamese regiments today fighting in South Vietnam. There are North Vietnamese armed forces in Laos being opposed by Laotian forces. There are North Vietnamese-trained guerrillas operating in Northeast Thailand. There are Communist dissident elements in Burma who are being aided, encouraged and helped from outside Burma across the Chinese frontier.

There was a major Communist effort in 1965 to pull off a coup d'état against Indonesia. You don't need the domino theory. Look at their proclaimed doctrine and look at what they're doing about it.

Now, we would like to see peace in South Vietnam and in Southeast Asia just as quickly as possible. It takes two to make a peace; and we would like to see some indication from the other side that they accept the notion that all countries, large and small, as the U.N. charter puts it, have a right to live in peace without molestation from across their frontiers.

When that moment comes, there can be peace very quickly, indeed; and the United States will be no obstacle whatever in making a peace on that basis.

#### ASIAN ALLIES

Q: Mr. Secretary, do you foresee a greater effort or greater participation by some of the Asian allies in Vietnam, and what are the prospects for a meeting of the seven nations contributing troops there?

A: On the question of a meeting the seven nations do keep in touch with each other by various means. There is no present time or date for such a meeting. We would expect that one might well occur, but that does not mean that we're not in continuing contact with each other.

As far as forces are concerned, this will be for each country to determine for itself; and each country would make its own announcements on that subject.

Of course, we would be glad to see additional forces from other countries involved in South Vietnam.

I do want to emphasize that the present effort is not negligible. South Vietnam has something like 700,000 men under arms. I think the comparable figure for us would be somewhere in the range of nine million compared to their population or any other measure you want to put on it.

The Laotian forces are engaged in Laos. The Thais are engaged in Northeast Thailand, in addition to what they have been putting into South Vietnam.

So that there is a significant effort by the countries of Southeast Asia to fend off this pressure from the North.

#### CHE GUEVARA

Q: Mr. Secretary, I'd like to ask you on another subject for a second—whether you have satisfied yourself that the man killed in Bolivia within the week was indeed Che Guevara.

A: Well, I have no—when you say have I satisfied myself, I have no personal, independent proof. But, on the other hand, I have no reason whatever to doubt the reports which have come in from the Bolivian government. And I am proceeding on the basis that it was Che Guevara, and without any reason whatever to doubt it.

#### RED ARMS TO ARABS

Q: Mr. Secretary, would you assess for us the stand of Soviet arms delivery to the Arab nations, especially in view of the conflicting estimates?

A: Well, I think I wouldn't want to get into figures. I've seen some estimates that appear to me to be too high. There was some significant resupply of certain of the Arab forces by the Soviet Union following the events of last June. We have, as you know, publicly, as well as privately, proposed that the principal arms-supplying countries get together with the countries in the area and try to find some ceiling on the arms race in that area. It is the one point on which we have been, I think, most disappointed up to this point; but I wouldn't want to try to straighten out figures, as between 60 per cent or 80 per cent and figures of that sort.

#### MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

Q: Mr. Secretary, on the diplomatic front in the Middle East, there have been several U.S.-Soviet meetings on the subject lately. Does this diplomatic activity indicate that you're making any progress within the present framework on this subject? Can you report anything to us on that?

A: Well, in our business we work at such questions very hard, on the basis that progress is possible and that a good result can be achieved. We have not yet reached that result. It is, therefore, little hazardous to indicate whether we feel that real progress is being made.

What is happening is private consultation among the countries in the area, or with countries in the area and among certain of the countries outside the larger powers, to see if we could find a basis on which there can be a permanent peace in the area.

Now, this turns critically upon the attitude of the countries in the area. At the present time I do not think that it turns upon major differences or conflicts among the great powers but, nevertheless, it is not easy for the great powers to agree among themselves unless they know what the attitudes of the countries in the area will be.

Now, I think this process is likely to continue. I don't think that time is working now on the side of a peaceful settlement. I think it is important for some movement to get started and that the United Nations has both a responsibility and an opportunity here in this situation.

So these discussions go on. They go on in great detail, with many governments. And I would hope that before too long we could find a formula which would move this situation toward that permanent peace which we desperately hope for, and which I think the ordinary peoples of the area would welcome if it could be obtained.

#### U.S. IMAGE ABROAD

Q: Mr. Secretary, one of the elements in the public discussion over stopping the bombing particularly, in Congress, seems to be senatorial worries about how the United States is regarded abroad. Senators have heard the opening debate in the General Assembly, where Foreign Minister after Foreign Minister has urged the United States to stop the bombing.

When you are confronted with a concern like that—I think almost 30 Foreign Ministers asked for a pause in the bombing—how do you reply to that concern? And, linked with that is Sen. Cooper's proposal to stop bombing except on the infiltration routes above the DMZ.

A: Well, on the last point—a proposal to stop the bombing except on the infiltration routes would be categorically rejected by Hanoi; and not move us one inch toward peace, unless Hanoi makes a major change in its position. Your count on Foreign Ministers is a little higher than mine, in terms of stopping the bombing.

You know, I haven't found anyone in the world—private citizen, or public official, in

this or other governments—who have come to me and said, "If you stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi, then our attitude would change."

I had a group of private citizens in not long ago to talk about this, and they wanted us to stop the bombing. I said, "All right, if we stop the bombing—we have stopped it on a number of occasions—"If we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?" They said, "No, of course, not."

I could only say well, if we can't influence you by stopping the bombing, how do you expect us to influence Hanoi by stopping the bombing?

Now I would be glad to hear from any of these Foreign Ministers what their governments will do if we stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi. And I want to hear that. I haven't heard it from anybody.

I do know what the British Cochairman would do if we stopped the bombing: Make a maximum effort to get this matter moved toward peace.

But, if Hanoi is saying "No," all the time, then he has very little chance. And, if the other Cochairman won't cooperate, there is very little chance.

So I would like to hear somebody tell me what they would do if we stopped the bombing. It is not just Hanoi who is not saying that.

#### HANOI OFFER?

Q: Mr. Secretary, on that point, is it not correct that this Government was informed by the Soviet government, on the authorization of Hanoi, that if the bombing was stopped there would be a conference between the United States and North Vietnam within three or four weeks?

A: No, we were not informed that. We were not informed of that. There was a public statement by Mr. Kosygin, in London. But Hanoi has not said that, to our knowledge. Anyhow, just in case they should say it, why three or four weeks? Why not the next morning?

Q: Is that a material difference?

A: Well, I don't know. But I don't know what waiting for three or four weeks means.

But what we need—There is no one in the world who has been able to tell us what Hanoi would do if we stopped the bombing.

Now, we don't have to speculate about this; we checked this out with Hanoi. We don't have to speculate and engage in wishful thinking, and proceed on a hypothetical basis, and think that maybe the atmosphere would be improved. Of course, the atmosphere would be improved over North Vietnam. But what we want to know is "What would happen?" and Hanoi is not willing to tell us what would happen, and no one else is able to tell us what would happen. So, we want to hear something.

For us to say, "We will stop, you go right ahead with your war; you live there safely and comfortably, without being disturbed while you send your men and arms into South Vietnam for the next 50 years," where would be the incentive for peace?

Now, we are interested in peace; we are not interested in a sanctuary which will let them carry on these operations against South Vietnam and Laos for eternity; while they sit there in their sanctuary taking their own time, paying no price, trying to seize their neighbors by force. Now, let's not be children. Yes.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

Q: Mr. Secretary, one of the questions—basic questions—that seems to be emerging in this Senate debate is whether our national security is really at stake in Vietnam, and whether Vietnam represents an integral part of our defense perimeter in the Pacific.

Your earlier statement indicates that you think our security is at stake in Vietnam. I think it would help in this debate if you would perhaps elaborate and explain why

you think our security is at stake in Vietnam.

A: Within the next decade or two, there will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

Now the free nations of Asia will make up at least a billion people. They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of a doctrine of the world revolution. The militancy of China has isolated China, even within the Communist world, but they have not drawn back from it. They have reaffirmed it, as recently as their reception of their great and good friend, Albania, two days ago.

Now we believe that the free nations of Asia must brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with cooperation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent—if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years. We would hope that in China there would emerge a generation of leadership that would think seriously about what is called "peaceful co-existence," that would recognize the pragmatic necessity for human beings to live together in peace, rather than on a basis of continuing warfare.

Now from a strategic point of view, it is not very attractive to think of the world cut in two by Asian communism, reaching out through Southeast Asia and Indonesia, which we know has been their objective; and that these hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia should be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking, so that their future is circumscribed by fear.

Now these are vitally important matters to us, who are both a Pacific and an Atlantic power. After all, World War II hit us from the Pacific, and Asia is where two-thirds of the world's people live. So we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the free nations of Asia to live in peace; and to turn the interests of people in mainland China to the pragmatic requirements of their own people, and away from a doctrinaire and ideological adventurism abroad.

#### COMMITMENTS

Q: Could I ask just one follow-up question on that, sir?

Do you think you can fulfill this very large commitment of containment and still meet the commitment of the Manila conference—to withdraw within six months after a peace agreement has been reached?

A: Oh, yes, I think so.

That does not mean that we ourselves have nominated ourselves to be the policemen for all of Asia. We have, for good reasons, formed alliances with Korea and Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand; and South Vietnam is covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty.

That doesn't mean that we are the general policemen. Today, the Laotian forces are carrying the burden in Laos on the ground. The Thais are carrying the burden in Thailand; the Burmese are carrying the burden in Burma; the Indians are carrying the burden upon their northeastern frontier—the Sikkim border—and whatever other threat there might be in that direction.

But we have our part; we have accepted a share, and we have accepted that share as a part of the vital national interest of the United States.

Now what I don't understand is that Senators would declare in August, 1964, that the United States considers it a vital national interest of this country that there be international peace and security of Southeast Asia. And, then, two years later, some of them seem to brush that aside as having no validity. Now that wasn't a Tonkin Bay reaction.

Paragraph 1 was Tonkin Bay. Paragraph 2 was Southeast Asia.

Now if people change their minds, then it is fair to ask the question:

"On which occasion were they right?"

Now I personally believe they were right in August, 1964. And perhaps they will be right again if they come back to that position—1968 or '69.

But these are not matters that change with the wind. These have to do with the possibility of organizing a peace on a planet on which human beings can destroy each other. Now perhaps we could at least agree that that is the central question, even though there could be some debate about how you do it.

And I believe that those who think that you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades; and they have not sustained that burden of proof.

#### CENTRAL OBJECTIVE

Q: Mr. Secretary, would you describe the net objective here than as the containment of Chinese Communist militancy?

A: No. The central objective is an organized and reliable peace.

Now if China pushes out against those with whom we have alliances, then we have a problem, but so does China. If China pushes out against the Soviet Union, both China and the Soviet Union have a problem.

We are not picking out ourselves, we are not picking out Peking as some sort of special enemy. Peking has nominated itself by proclaiming a militant doctrine of the world revolution, and doing something about it. This is not a theoretical debate; they are doing something about it.

Now we can live at peace—we have not had a war with the Soviet Union, in 50 years of co-existence, since their revolution. We are not ourselves embarked upon an ideological campaign to destroy anybody who calls themselves Communist. But we are interested in the kind of world structure sketched in Articles I and II of the United Nations charter, in which all nations, large and small, have a right to live in peace.

And the aggressors nominate themselves—we don't choose them—the aggressors nominate themselves by what they say and do. And when they do, then those who are genuinely interested in peace have a problem on their hands, and sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested, and we find out what kind of people we are. And I think one of the most important historical facts in this postwar period has been that the almost unbelievable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

Q: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

#### THE VICE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in an address to the 40th anniversary meeting of the Future Farmers of America, a one-time smalltown boy from Doland, S. Dak., now the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, made a plea to the young people participating to help provide leadership to build up our rural communities and create a good life in smaller towns away from our stricken cities.

I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA, KANSAS CITY, MO., OCTOBER 11, 1967

This 40th anniversary of the Future Farmers of America is a great occasion for me. I can make a claim none of you young people can—I have followed your progress for the full forty years.

Just a few weeks ago I had an excellent progress report from your national officers who visited me in Washington.

Let me hasten to add that I cannot remember the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act for Vocational Training in Agriculture which got this whole movement started.

Because of what I know about you I have the greatest confidence in your future.

I am confident primarily for one reason—I feel that you have always had, and continue to have, a sense of the tremendous and exciting opportunities open to you. Despite a bad impression created by a very few, I know that faith in the future is a characteristic of most of your generation. And since half of our citizens are under 25 today, it is a hopeful sign for this nation.

What kind of a future are we going to build for ourselves and for America? (I say "We" because I fully expect to be in this with you for a long time).

One thing is certain: Whatever path we choose, we will have a lot to work with.

Our country is rich, and it is going to grow a lot richer as we move through the last third of this Twentieth Century.

American farms produce a greater abundance than any other farms in the world, and that abundance will surely increase.

Planes and cars will be faster, communications quicker, life longer. Our astronauts will move farther out into space, our oceanographers will probe the depths of the sea.

By every measurement of quantity, size and speed we shall move forward.

But what about the quality of American life? How are we going to use our abundance?

A great American President—and citizen of this state—Harry Truman—once said: "Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice."

Is it reasonable and just when smoke and waste from our automobiles and industries poison the air we breathe and pollute our water?

Is it reasonable and just when one family in seven in this rich country doesn't have enough to eat, enough to wear, a decent place to live?

Is it reasonable and just when young people your age cannot share your hope in the future because they were born in poverty... because they had to leave school too soon... because they grew up in broken homes?

Is it reasonable and just that rural America should lose precious human resources while at the same time our cities grow ever larger, more congested, more burdened with slums?

It is that last question I especially want to discuss with you today—as young people who have a personal stake in finding the right answer... who have a stake in proving that Americans do have the "moral and intellectual capacity" to govern themselves with reason and justice.

What are the hard facts of the emigration from rural America?

Between 1950 and 1960, 11 million Americans moved from the countryside to the city. During that time, the population of our rural areas was static. All the growth of American population occurred in the cities, and that trend has continued. We can expect to have 100 million more Americans by the end of this century—just over thirty years from now. And if the present trend continues,



they are almost all going to be jammed together in a few sprawling metropolitan areas.

People leave the country for many reasons. Poverty is one. Many who leave are Negro Americans who see their only chance in the city.

But they don't have the skills they need to hold a city job. They know nothing about city life. They find themselves confined to crowded, run-down apartments and neighborhoods . . . humiliated and frustrated in an alien world of unemployment, welfare and crime. And their dream of hope turns into a nightmare of despair.

But these Americans are only part of the story. A lot of people leave perfectly comfortable homes in our small towns and on our farms because they think they have to go to the big city to enjoy a decent standard of living . . . get a good education . . . provide a better life for their families.

Most of those people are under thirty, and by far the largest group are young people who have just finished high school—people about your age whose whole productive lives are ahead of them.

It is sad but true that those people often pack up and move with good reason.

One third of the Americans who live on farms, live in poverty. The figure is only one-seventh in the cities—not good, but a little better.

The average rural teenager completes about 9 years of school. The figure is over 12 in the cities.

The proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is for industrial workers. Some 73 percent of urban households, headed by a man with a job, have an automobile, telephone, hot-and-cold running water, and sound housing. The figure is 60 percent in rural towns, and less than 50 percent on the farm.

Only a small percentage of small or middle-sized towns offer live theater, an art gallery, an orchestra, first-rate medical care, a variety of stores and shops. Almost all our metropolitan areas do.

We know these facts are misleading and do not tell the whole story. But they do point to reasons why rural America continues to lose some of its best people.

They leave, and what does it mean?

It means there are fewer people to pay taxes in the rural areas . . . that the schools cannot afford the most modern equipment . . . that shops and businesses close. More people leave, and the vicious cycle continues.

A recent Gallup Poll showed that half of the American people would prefer to live in the country or in a small town; but most do not. They simply feel they do not have a choice.

By now, most of you are probably saying, "I didn't know we had it so bad."

Well, don't worry. My speech is not over, and before I am done you may feel a little better about it.

Because there is something we can do about the quality of life in America—both urban and rural America.

Unlike any other nation in history—unlike almost any other nation in the world today—we have the technology and the resources to extend all the benefits of modern living to every American, regardless of where he chooses to live.

We can have real freedom of choice in America.

The challenge is to put our technology and resources to work in the right combination, in the right places.

The problems which we see in our cities need treatment now. Slums . . . pollution . . . congestion . . . crime . . . unemployment . . . lack of education, require a direct attack.

They cannot be treated indirectly with trickle-down progress.

But many of our urban problems have their roots in the rural problems which I have mentioned.

We cannot save our cities by creating a better life in the country. It is far too late for that.

But it does mean that if we make up for our past neglect of farm communities . . . and of the middle-sized towns of 10-thousand, 30-thousand, 50-thousand people that dot this country, we will be building a better America for all Americans, wherever they live.

I am not talking about recreating those mythical "good old days" down on the farm. I lived those good old days—dust storms, mortgage foreclosures, isolation, the one-room schoolhouse, life on the fringe, and dreams turned away.

I am not even talking about unpolluted air and the smell of fresh cut hay.

There is more to life than that and I think we can all share the best.

In the 1930's modernizing rural America meant rural electrification and a movie theatre in every town.

In the 1940's, it meant many and well-paved roads.

Now, it means airports capable of handling short-hop jets . . . community colleges . . . modern hospitals and good doctors . . . the very best in elementary and secondary education.

It means golf courses and ballparks. It means drama groups and art classes in addition to quilting bees.

We know it can be done, because we have seen it done. To make my point, let me give you an extreme example: Huntsville, Alabama.

Huntsville used to be a small Southern town—a place where people were born and died, but where they spent little time in-between.

Then the TVA went into action. Huntsville got access to electric power. It got access to water for transport and for recreation.

Then scientific and space installations moved in. Other industries followed. New stores began to meet the needs of new customers. New taxpayers built new schools.

Huntsville is today a good place not only to be from but to be.

But Huntsville is the exception and not the rule.

It tells us what can be done, if all things come together in the right way.

A basic ingredient of success is obviously jobs—jobs based not only on agriculture but on medium and small industry . . . on research facilities . . . on distribution centers . . . on enterprises which do not have to be in large metropolitan areas to prosper and grow.

There is a lot that government at all levels can do to help. We can use the economic weight of the Defense Department and other government contracts for research, development, and production. We can offer tax incentives, subsidies, new programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, such as we are putting to work in our big cities.

We can help to provide the same things, on a smaller scale, that have made Huntsville such a positive example.

But other initiatives will have to come from those who live in rural America—and especially its young people.

You can work through rural community development groups to attract the kind of job-producing enterprises your communities need.

Sell businessmen on the natural resources and recreation opportunities available in your town. Tell them about the manpower available—manpower that has handled machinery since childhood.

Show them clean communities. Show them active civic groups. Show them schools,

churches and parks—the things that prove you care about your future.

For in the last analysis it is the people themselves who know their own needs best and can best build the kind of future they want.

You have the chance now, as future leaders of your towns and communities, to help build an America that truly does offer freedom of choice:

Where young people can find a rich and rewarding life in every community.

Where stimulating work . . . the best in education and health care . . . sports and recreation . . . music and the arts, are as much a part of everyday life in Kansas as in Chicago, Nebraska as in New York.

And, by so doing, you have the chance to help restore, too, to urban America the sense of community and of neighborliness . . . the human values that have been so much a part of American heritage.

In the words of President Johnson:

"History records a long hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses. It took many centuries—and many bloody revolutions—to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else . . . if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities . . . the welfare of this nation demands it."

I have no doubt that we shall meet this challenge of providing a true life of choice for all Americans.

That is the opportunity history has given us in the last third of the Twentieth Century.

We can do it.

In the words, again, of Harry Truman: "It is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people."

#### POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE GEN. GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL, ORIGINATOR OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, today, on the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, the Post Office Department is issuing a stamp to commemorate the originator of that plan, Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

The first-day ceremonies for the stamp, one of the Department's "Prominent Americans" series, are being held this afternoon in Lexington, Va., at the George C. Marshall Research Library of Virginia Military Institute, General Marshall's alma mater.

In an address dedicating the George C. Marshall stamp, Postmaster General O'Brien recalls that it was Winston Churchill who wrote of Marshall:

Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example.

The issuance of the Marshall stamp will be of great help, I am confident, in the continuing effort of the Marshall Research Library to keep the memory of General Marshall alive in the minds of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent the address by Postmaster General O'Brien be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE FIRST DAY CEREMONY OF THE GEORGE C. MARSHALL STAMP, GEORGE C. MARSHALL RESEARCH LIBRARY, LEXINGTON, VA., OCTOBER 24, 1967

I am very pleased to join with so many distinguished Americans here today in honoring General Marshall.

I have always felt that the character of a nation is best discovered, not in its material wealth, not in its literature or art, not in its cities, not in its natural resources—but, rather, in the caliber of men it chooses for leadership.

If we apply that touchstone to George Catlett Marshall, we need not fear for the future of our nation.

For truly, George Catlett Marshall was a leader in the American mold.

He was completely devoted to duty and to country.

Honored at home and abroad he sought no honors for himself.

While often wounded by men of narrow vision, he shrugged off those attacks as unrepresentative and unworthy of a free people.

When his true brilliance and splendid potential were bypassed by the slowness of promotion in our neglected Army before World War II, he did not fulminate against the Republic, he did not plot, he did not curse his fate, and, above all, *he did not quit*. Instead, he swallowed the injustice of the system, and worked and planned for a military force capable of assuring the security of our nation.

Few Americans have served longer or with more distinction than this man, who began his military career outside the traditional channel of a West Point education. Few men have risen so high by force of intellect, by solid achievement, by devotion to the common good.

And few have stood more consistently for the ideals and beliefs which they cherished.

And through that consistency he helped mold our concept of what an American should be.

His character, so unblemished, so rock-fast, has made plain the wisdom of the Founding Fathers when they agreed that no titles of nobility should be granted by the United States Government. For the recognized nobility of General George Marshall soared far beyond the scope of some external title. His was the *true* nobility, the *earned* nobility, the nobility of soul and mind.

During the most critical hours of our nation's life, when we were in a death struggle with the most evil tyranny to stalk mankind since Attila the Hun, and later, when we grappled with the chaos and the ruins after the destruction of that tyranny, George Catlett Marshall was one of the handful of men who guided the destiny of our nation.

Our free institutions yet stand, and tens and hundreds of thousands of people are alive today because of the clarity of his vision, the unerring foresight of his counsel.

I have spoken to many who knew or closely observed George Marshall during those dark days of wartime conflict and post-war confusion and all were united in their assessment of his steadiness under even the most extreme provocation.

He chose his course wisely, but that course was always based on ideals—ideals that reflected the best in our American tradition.

And those ideals in which he did believe he espoused with a fervor and sense of deep conviction often lacking in some quarters today. In these times it seems many are twisted by momentary winds of change, by transient opinion, and lose their balance under the buffeting of so many complex events.

When our nation faced its most awesome test, when its military force was in disarray, when we needed above all the very best that

we could produce, when we asked, "God give us statesmen!" we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

When we recognized that "A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands," we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

When we needed "Men who possess opinions and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie," we turned to George Catlett Marshall.

We turned to him and we placed crushing responsibilities on his shoulders. He accepted the burden and he succeeded. With high honors he retired to the peaceful life he much preferred.

And then his nation turned to him once more, and he responded as all who knew him expected he would.

Appointed special emissary to a crumbling China in a mission that could not succeed, he did all that man could do to restore peace . . . appointed Secretary of State, his brilliant mind produced the plan which bears his name, the plan that Churchill once called "the most unsordid act in history". . . appointed Secretary of Defense, he welded our military force into a new and greater unity and power.

It is important to remember George Catlett Marshall for two reasons.

The first is that greatness in and of itself demands respect and remembrance.

The second is equal in importance and often overlooked.

For a great career exemplifies the finest response by a fellow human being to periods of crisis and stress.

To ignore the lesson and merely concentrate on a eulogy is to do a disservice to George Catlett Marshall.

And so, my friends, I would like to propose for your consideration what I consider to be the most significant lesson from the life of this man, a lesson that might serve us well in our own days of crisis.

In my mind, that lesson is the willing acceptance of the hard road of responsibility rather than the easy road of comfort and acclaim.

I vividly recall seeing in England a memorial to President Kennedy with the words from his inaugural address—"Ask not what your country can do for you. . . ." Well, General Marshall always asked what he could do for his country. He gladly accepted the responsibility.

I think he would be saddened but not surprised that those who follow after him still face a world in which violence is more common than cooperation. He would be saddened, yes, but he also would not choose now, as he did not choose during life, to ignore the crises or to suggest that the threat to his country would disappear by wishing rather than by acting.

Where would George Marshall have stood on the question of Vietnam?

There is no doubt about the answer. He would have deeply regretted, as President Johnson deeply regrets, the necessity of fighting in Vietnam.

He would have mourned, as President Johnson mourns, the death of American fighting men in Vietnam.

He would have tried to bring about peace and cooperation, as President Johnson is trying with every ounce of his energy, to bring about peace and cooperation.

But he also would have done what must be done to protect America and preserve our democratic process.

Not for a moment would he have confused what should be—a peaceful world—with what is: a world where aggression still blights lives and seeks to destroy freedom.

He would have fought for a finer world as a legacy to America's children.

He would not have chosen, as President Johnson does not choose, a legacy of peace that is no more than a pause while our enemies regroup, rearm, rebuild.

Presented with the choice between an agonizing struggle and an America fleeing from a difficult problem, I am certain where his choice would lie.

He refused to retreat from the hard, responsible road when he was under personal attack. He once said that, "The hardest thing I ever did was to keep my temper. I had to work with those people, and that was that." He knew his responsibility, and he accepted it.

This is why I am proud to dedicate the George C. Marshall stamp on this Twentieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan—which also, as you know, is United Nations Day. This stamp will serve as millions of reminders of the greatest cooperative effort ever undertaken. And that is well. But it will also turn our eyes millions of times to the undeniable fact that here was a man who was great because of his courage, of his willingness to submerge his own ambition to the common good, who understood that the right decision is often not the easy decision, but that a great people do not remain great by easy answers and wishful thinking.

Winston Churchill, writing of General Marshall's career, stated that "Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example." This stamp will reinforce the efforts continually being made by the George Marshall Research Library to keep the memory of this gentle warrior.

My friends, I am honored to issue this stamp in our "Prominent Americans" series for a man who was certainly first in war and among those first in the hearts of his countrymen. George Marshall was a Prominent American, truly a great American.

#### ESCALATING THE WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I sometimes regret that newspapers do not headline noncontroversial news as prominently as they do our difficulties and our differences.

What I regard as the major news story of the month from official quarters was the sending last Saturday of an airgram to our AID missions around the world, signaling increased food-for-peace assistance.

Our missions were advised, over the signature of Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

There is ample food available to meet program requirements which were curtailed last fiscal year because of limited supplies of some commodities.

The missions were further advised:

The President has a personal interest in seeing that our food resources are used to improve nutrition and child feeding and he has been assured by the Secretary of Agriculture and the A.I.D. administrator that special attention will be given to using our food resources for this purpose. We believe that there are additional opportunities for imaginative use of Title II commodities for the expansion or establishment of meaningful programs to combat malnutrition, particularly in infants and pre-school age children, to provide school children with nutritious meats, and to promote community development and other self-help activities, with particular emphasis on increasing agricultural production. Such activities may be carried out under the auspices of voluntary agencies as well as government-to-government programs.

Because I have been impatient for just such an order as this, I invite attention to it and commend the administration for its dispatch and express the hope that our missions, AID, and the Department



of Agriculture will, in the words of the airgram.

Utilize more effectively title II authority to help developing countries gain ground in the food and population race, and to help speed up social and economic progress.

I am advised that the same sort of acceleration, or escalation, of the title I concessional sales program authorized under food for peace is underway at the Department of Agriculture.

This is what Congress intended and authorized in the Food for Peace Act of 1966.

The war against hunger is the one war in which we have a great tactical and logistic advantage; a war that can be waged with humanitarianism rather than bloodshed; and a war from which all mankind will benefit—a war we can win if we try.

The dispatch of Saturday's airgram will be good news to millions of Americans, and it will have the approval of an overwhelming majority of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the airgram to our AID missions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the airgram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: Aid/Washington.

Subject: War on Hunger—Expanded Use of Title II Food for Freedom Commodities.

1. Consistent with the new PFF legislation which authorizes the use of PL 480 Title II food supplies to combat hunger and malnutrition, stimulate agricultural productivity abroad and promote general economic and community development in the developing countries, emphasis has been placed on tailoring U.S. production to meet requirements at home and abroad. There is ample food available to meet program requirements which were curtailed last fiscal year because of limited supplies of some commodities. Our task now is to utilize more effectively Title II authority to help developing countries gain ground in the food and population race and to help speed up social and economic progress. Increased availability of PL 480 commodities, particularly wheat and wheat products, coarse grains and vegetable oils offer opportunities to help offset the economic and political effects of reduced levels of other forms of assistance.

2. The President has a personal interest in seeing that our food resources are used to improve nutrition and child feeding and he has been assured by the Secretary of Agriculture and the A.I.D. Administrator that special attention will be given to using our food resources for this purpose. We believe there are additional opportunities for imaginative uses of Title II commodities for the expansion of establishment of meaningful programs to combat malnutrition, particularly in infants and pre-school age children, to provide school children with nutritious meals, and to promote community development and other self-help activities, with special emphasis on increasing agricultural production. Such activities may be carried out under the auspices of voluntary agencies as well as government-to-government programs.

3. We are attaching for your information and for the special attention of Food for Freedom Officers two examples of effective Title II programs (Korea, Morocco). A third example involving an American Voluntary Agency (CRS), and the Government of the Philippines will be made available shortly. These illustrate the role Title II programs can play in social and economic develop-

ment in rural areas and are the types of activities we have in mind.

4. We recognize that increased administrative resources may be needed by the Missions, Voluntary and International Agencies and host governments to effectively implement food programs in light of the foregoing. Missions are urged therefore to evaluate the management available to direct, administer and monitor expanded Title II activities. It is important that proposed programs do not exceed effective management capabilities; that they conform to the concept of self-help and in no way detract from the basic objective of assisting aid recipients eventually to stand on their own feet. It is also important that programs conform to Sec. 202 of the Act: "... Except in the case of emergency, the President shall take reasonable precaution to assure that commodities ... will not displace or interfere with sales which might otherwise be made ..."

5. *Action Requested.*—Review the possibilities of increasing the use of commodities available under Title II consistent with the priorities set forth in the Guidelines which were transmitted with AID Circular XA 2367, dated 4/5/67. Please advise AID/W of the outcome of this review by not later than November 15, 1967.

6. New program proposals or amendments to current programs received by March 1, 1968 will be processed as FY '68 programs. Submissions received after that date will be considered as part of the FY '69 programs.

Rusk.

## PRESS FREEDOM BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the De Pere, Wis., Journal, whose editor and publisher is Mr. Paul J. Creviere, recently published an excellent editorial on the freedom of the press, which I commend to the attention of all Senators. The editorial deals with a truth too often forgotten—that the newsman's right to know is really an extension of the public's right to know. To put shackles on the newsman's freedom to obtain information about the workings of local, State, or National Government is to limit the public's right to know, thus threatening the very foundations of our democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PRESS FREEDOM BELONGS TO PEOPLE

Who ever told that nosey editor he had a right to pry into what happened at our council meeting? What gave that reporter any idea that he could write about the school directors the way he did?

The answer is that there is no law, rule, regulation or order that specifically requires a newspaper reporter to cover city council, school board or court sessions. The Constitution says "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of the press." One can search out all of the laws of the Federal Government, right down to the Freedom of Information bill passed by the 89th Congress, and find nothing further about "the press."

The same can be said of state law. Most state constitutions recognize freedom of the press to publish news, but none particularize these rights, or set down any press responsibilities.

The newspaper is not required to report the city council meeting or send someone to the school directors' sessions. The reporter could stay home. Nor do laws specify that "the press" be accorded any special treat-

ment before any public body. "Open meeting laws" never mention newspapers, reporters, or news media. They simply affirm the right of the public at large to attend and observe meetings of governing assemblies.

Mrs. Smith, then, can "cover" the city council—for her club, her neighborhood, or just for herself. The principle of open government meetings was established for the people—the resident, the voter, the taxpayer, all the governed—not solely for the press or its representatives.

Then why is it that "the right to know" and "freedom of information" always seem to be linked with the press?

In the very early days of American settlement all of the people of a local community would gather in the town meeting and determine the affairs of the community. Almost everybody attended, and those who didn't, soon learned from the informed majority.

But villages soon grew into cities, and the "pure democracy" of the town meeting gave way to representative democracy. Government was growing more remote from the people. It was also growing more complicated. Yet the citizen, as a voter, had the same responsibility to keep himself informed.

It followed naturally that the Nation's fledgling press should fill the role of reporter and commentator on public affairs. No one passed a law requiring it. The Founding Fathers simply had faith that a private press, given the guarantee of freedom to do so, would accept the responsibility. And of course it has. For nearly two centuries newspapers have attended meetings of governing bodies, reporting and interpreting in behalf of the public.

The reporter attends city council meetings as a member of the public. He has a right to be present only if the public retains that right. The editor comments on the council's decisions—or lack of them—as an ordinary citizen. While he is aided in his function by the printing press at his disposal, it gives him no special rights. He can comment only so long as the public has a privilege of commenting.

The "right to know" and "freedom of information" are concepts with which the newsman works every day. The same professional tradition which sends him to the city council meeting compels him to resist inroads on these public rights. For he knows, and the public should always realize too, that in all that he does, the newspaperman acts as a citizen, in behalf of his fellow citizens.

## SUPPORT FROM AUSTRALIA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, Australia's External Affairs Minister, Paul Hasluck, in a statement recently to the U.N. General Assembly said, in effect, that the world we live in is still round and is still governed with regard to the relationships of one nation to another by military power in many instances. He said:

Surely we are using double standards and falsifying the issues if, recognizing the realities of power, we find it improper or worse for one small nation to be protected by a great ally but unexceptional for some other small nation to be protected by its ally.

Essentially, what Mr. Hasluck was asking, as the Evening Star pointed out in an editorial October 20, was why some think it wrong for Australia, which is helping out in South Vietnam in a very substantial way, when such actions always were applauded in Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Support From Down Under," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SUPPORT FROM DOWN UNDER

Australia's External Affairs Minister, Paul Hasluck, made a statement to the U.N. General Assembly last week which is worthy of more than passing attention. And since Australia can hardly be classed as a "client state," we trust that his remarks will be duly noted by Senator Fulbright and all others who share the Arkansas senator's views on the war in Vietnam.

Australia is assisting South Vietnam with both troops and civilian aid. An increase in the Australian troop commitment has just been announced in Canberra. And Australia also made its contribution to both great wars in Europe. Australia, in short, believes in freedom and opposes aggression.

Mr. Hasluck wanted to know whether his country was right in standing up for these things in Europe but wrong in standing up for them in Asia. He went on to say: "Unfortunately, this is still a world in which peace is kept and security maintained by military power. . . . Are such realities as these to be recognized only in one hemisphere and not in another? Are arguments that peace and security are global to be true in European or Atlantic power situations but not true when crises of power arise in Asia and the Pacific?"

The Australian representative concluded on this note: "Surely we are using double standards and falsifying the issues if, recognizing the realities of power, we find it improper or worse for one small nation to be protected by a great ally but unexceptional for some other small nation to be protected by its ally."

We have seen nothing which states the case better for what the United States and its allies are doing in South Vietnam, or which more effectively reveals the hollowness, one might say the disingenuousness, of the arguments used to condemn what is being done.

#### RELOCATION ASSISTANCE FOR PRIVATE NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, one of the most vexing problems faced by many private nonprofit organizations engaging in the rehabilitation of residential buildings in slum areas is that of relocating the displaced families.

If the area happens to be owned by a local urban renewal authority, relocation assistance to families displaced by demolition or rehabilitation has been available through section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949. Suppose the rehabilitation of dwellings within the urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area is performed by a private nonprofit neighborhood improvement group, rather than by the local public agency conducting the urban renewal program. Would the displaced families be eligible to receive relocation assistance from the same source?

Inasmuch as this question had apparently not been raised before, I requested a legal opinion from the Department of Housing and Urban Development on it. I am pleased to announce that, in the opinion of the Department, relocation assistance can be provided to families displaced by private rehabilitation programs as well as those conducted under public auspices, provided only that the displacement occurs within an urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area and

the program is conducted in accord with the plans and regulations applicable to those areas. This opinion opens up an important new avenue of assistance to neighborhood organizations, and I ask that its full text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### QUESTIONS IN SENATOR PERCY'S LETTER CONCERNING AVAILABILITY OF RELOCATION PAYMENTS

Senator Percy asked if an individual or family displaced from residential property in an urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement area as a result of rehabilitation activities conducted by a nonprofit organization with private funds would be eligible to receive a relocation payment. We believe that under these circumstances the individual or family would be eligible. The important consideration here is that the program of rehabilitation would be carried out in accordance with an approved urban renewal plan or program of code enforcement. It is not necessary that the work be done with public funds. The rehabilitation which causes the vacation of the property is made necessary because the housing must be brought up to the standards of either the urban renewal plan or the codes applicable in the code enforcement area. The Relocation Regulations as published in the Federal Register, 30 F.R. 15145-49, December 8, 1965, clearly spell out the eligibility conditions which must be met before payment can be made for the type of displacement contemplated; see Sections 3.103 and 3.103a, respectively, of the Regulations. A copy of these Regulations is attached.

Senator Percy's letter also asked whether a family or individual would be eligible for relocation payments if the displacement occurred as a result of new construction instead of rehabilitation. This apparently relates to a situation where the standards of an urban renewal plan or the codes applicable in a code enforcement area necessitate a certain amount of rehabilitation or repair work on a structure to bring it into conformity with these standards, but the owner of the building desires instead to erect a completely new structure. Where the required rehabilitation or repair work would cause displacement of the occupants of the structure, we believe the necessary statutory determination could be made in the event of alternative demolition and new construction so as to permit relocation payments.

Of course, if the property on which the new structure was built had first been acquired and cleared by the local urban renewal agency and then sold to the nonprofit organization, anyone displaced by the activities of the urban renewal agency would be eligible for relocation payments. Also, if the structure was ordered to be demolished because of its failure to conform with code standards, the occupants of the structure would be eligible for relocation payments.

THOMAS C. McGRATH, Jr.,

General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

OCTOBER 2, 1967.

#### INTERNATIONAL FISH EXPO IN BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a few days ago the first American Commercial Fish Exposition was held in Boston, Mass. This exposition drew representatives from all aspects of the commercial fish industry—fishermen, shipbuilders, equipment manufacturers, processors, marketers, Govern-

ment officials, and news media representatives—and delegates from a great many foreign countries. The exposition was sponsored by the Boston Globe, whose distinguished publisher, Mr. Davis Taylor, was the guiding force behind this assembling in one place, for the first time, of all the many faces of the fishing industry. All of us who visited the expo were impressed by its scope, and I am sure that each visitor would agree with me that Davis Taylor deserves high praise for his work.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. MAGNUSON] visited the exposition on October 11 and made a forthright speech discussing the problems facing the industry. Senator MAGNUSON was particularly lucid in his statement of the need for effective international agreements to govern the use of the fishing grounds and catch of the various species. The upcoming conference in Moscow, to which the Senator referred, holds high promise for fishermen in the northeastern part of the United States, and I, like Senator MAGNUSON, hope that its negotiators are as successful as they were when dealing with the waters of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I know that many Members of the Senate will want to review the speech Senator MAGNUSON made in Boston, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. It is another in the long chain of speeches, statements, and—most important—actions which indicate that my good friend WARREN MAGNUSON intends to stand second to no man in his support for the American commercial fishing industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT FISHING SUBSIDIES

(Opening remarks by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, before a panel at the American Commercial Fish Exposition, Boston, Mass., October 11, 1967)

First of all, may I congratulate the citizens of Boston, the fishermen, industry, suppliers and exhibitors, who have gathered here for the first American Commercial Fish Exposition. And especially, the Boston Globe and those others who have associated with it in sponsoring this event. Boston and the entire State of Massachusetts should indeed be proud for the leadership demonstrated in organizing the mass of exhibits and a week of discussion dedicated to this nation's commercial fishermen and industry.

Frankly, when your great Senator Ted Kennedy, and the nationally honored and respected Speaker of the House of Representatives, John McCormack, came to me and asked that I speak and discuss fisheries with a panel here in Boston, I readily accepted. Whenever anybody talks to me about discussing fish, the answer is seldom anything but an enthusiastic "yes." The invitation was loud and clear, but when they mentioned the subject—fishing subsidies—I think their voices dropped to a whisper, for I can think of no more controversial subject during the past decade or so. But my agreement would have been no less enthusiastic for subjects of this kind need to be brought out in the open, and I look forward to the exchange of views with the three members



of our commercial fishing industry, each an expert in his respective discipline, and I hope from the discussion following my brief remarks we may find some good direction in this area of controversy, and often, bitter disagreement.

As most of you know, the Senate's Commerce Committee has jurisdiction in the area of Merchant Marine and Fisheries; in fact, one of the subcommittees is so named. For a long time I served as chairman of that subcommittee, in addition to the chairmanship of the full Committee. It was with great reluctance that I had to give consideration to relinquishing the responsibility in fisheries, but the opportunity to appoint Alaska's senior Senator "Bob" Bartlett to the post gave me the needed assurance that the future of this great American industry—which I refer to as America's first industry—would be in capable hands. And as Senator Bartlett would tell you—were he here today—I'm not only a member of his subcommittee, but my interest in the fisheries is greater than ever. Senator Kennedy and I have worked closely together in this vital area, and the staff of my Commerce Committee has enjoyed an especially close relationship with his own staff in trying to develop some programs of benefit to the United States fisheries.

Some four or five years ago—and the date is no longer of great importance—I introduced and was successful in securing unanimous adoption of a Senate resolution calling for a World Fisheries Conference. This was before we had any serious problems of depletion from foreign fishing in adjacent waters on the West Coast of the United States, and very likely it preceded serious conservation problems here in the Atlantic, on George's Bank or, certainly, in the mid-Atlantic bight. We had some salmon problems with Japan, however, on the great red salmon stocks of Bristol Bay up off Senator Bartlett's State, because of some problems of interpretation of the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention. Such subjects as "spirit and intent" were rapidly giving away to purely legalistic interpretation of that Treaty by the Japanese.

We were just then beginning to take this question of world hunger seriously, and it was my judgment—and still is—that the ocean resources offered the best hope for solution of that hunger problem. I have not wavered from the philosophy I expressed then—that hunger and war go hand in hand, and alleviation of the growing world food crisis could well be a key to the path toward peace.

But I also saw in this expansion of world fish harvest some dangers. I'm not going to point to any particular nations this morning, neither am I going to maintain that our own fishing industry enjoys some kind of conservation purity in ocean harvest. Again, there is no point in selecting industries or fisheries, but most of you have been around this fishing business long enough to know that the philosophies upon which our sea harvests have been based for centuries, that with modern fishing technology and mass fishing techniques, the oceans are not inexhaustible.

My proposal for a World Fisheries Conference lay dormant over in the State Department for some years. I suppose there were several reasons for this. One being, of course, that everybody didn't visualize the forthcoming massive effort off our own shores, which to me seemed inevitable. Then, our fisheries position in the U.S. State Department—where the logical motivation for such a World Conference rested—was not at a very high level. As I recall, Dr. W. M. Chapman, the first fish man there—and it was not an easy battle to get the office established was a "Special Assistant to the Undersecretary for Fish and Wildlife." His office may not have been in the basement of the State Department, but he had a tough time getting very far upstairs. Bill Herrington, since retired, was in the same position.

We had an office there, even if it was not much more than a "listening post". The need was apparent, however, for upgrading. It is here that I want to pay a little more tribute to your good Senator Kennedy—and a lot of other fishery-minded Senators from both the Atlantic and Pacific, the Gulf, and some from the inland areas who joined with me to upgrade that office. Believe me, it was not an easy task. We didn't get a Secretary of Fisheries as many wanted, but today Don McKernan, who succeeded Bill Herrington over in the State Department, is a Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk, and further, when we negotiate with other countries, fisheries need no longer be embarrassed for Mr. McKernan now enjoys the rank of Ambassador at such meetings.

There were other problems in this World Fisheries Conference idea, one of which was, and still is for that matter, the divided interests we have in the United States fisheries community. We are both a "coastal" nation and a "fishing" nation. That is, we have the fleets in Boston and my own good friends out in Seattle who fish primarily off our own coasts. But a large segment of this nation's domestic production comes from other people's shores—Southern California tuna and Gulf shrimp are prime examples. To these people any such world gathering as I suggested could conceivably depart from my desire for conservation discussion into jurisdiction, and thus further complicate problems which already are plaguing them with nations who claim two hundred miles or more—some not merely for fisheries but as a territorial sea, a matter of great concern to our national security.

A compromise was reached, and the United States went to the Fisheries Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, with the hope that they might assist in sponsorship. We've been in this exercise now for some years, and though the progress has been steady, it has been painfully slow. Perhaps, Senator Kennedy and I—and others interested in this area—may have to go back to my original intent if there is to be a conference at all.

In the last Congress we passed into law a nine mile fishery zone for the United States, commonly referred to as the twelve mile limit. You fishermen here in Boston and our fishermen out in the State of Washington said 200 miles was needed—or perhaps, the Continental Shelf—but twelve miles was the best we could do and it was not adopted without some pretty dedicated effort on the part of a number of us in the Congress.

The idea of a world conference has some interesting supporters, and some interesting objectors in the world community. I'm not going into many names here, for such would not be helpful if we are to be successful. But the Soviet Union is among those indicated support, and some other nations we count as closer friends in the normal world community have battled the U.S. efforts with near bitterness.

If we're going to be realists nowadays, we'd better recognize that we live in a new world; one where travel is reduced to hours instead of days, weeks or months. We also live in a world where an estimated two-thirds of our population go to bed hungry, and if peace is our goal, we'd best not totally ignore these desperate and growing statistics. But neither am I prepared to accept the kind of internationalizing of the oceans which seems to be getting unduly popular at the United Nations these days. And some of the breath for strength to these proposals comes from our own Congress. Although some of the economists are still busy dividing the oceans up into little squares for some kind of distribution to the fishing nations of the world, thus promoting some kind of Utopian efficiency, the recent move to advance such proposals through the United Nations seems to have abated some. It has not abated, however, as far as the wealth of the ocean floor

is concerned, and there has been much discussion in the Congress of late on this subject. I would make it very clear to you today that any such proposal coming before the United States Senate is going to have to get past my opposition, and the objections of a good many other members of that body. To me, the division of the ocean floor for minerals, or whatever, is only a step away from division of the fisheries, and I shall regard it as just such a threat.

This does not mean, however, that I oppose the efforts of the United Nations. I think very often we are inclined to look more at their failures and forget their successes. The newly established Fisheries Department, for example, in the FAO in Rome, headed by Roy Jackson, formerly the Director of the North Pacific Commission, is progressing well. The even more-recently formed Committee on Fisheries—or COFI—as they refer to it, with some 30 nations as members, is also doing well. Their work is important, and though the World Fisheries Conference may be moving very slowly there, I would urge a stronger support to them on the part of each of you, as well as our Government.

No one can really profit from depletion—certainly not in the long run. To be sure, some of the more greedy fishing nations have in the past been able to be sort of ocean opportunists. Deplete a fishery here, then move on to another. In our day, however, the world is running out of new frontiers, or virgin fishing grounds. In the absence of that World Fisheries Conference, which I have long maintained could induce some reason into this wild "race for fish," the United States has been forced to become concerned about foreign fishing off our own Coast. I could talk about some of the flatfishes in the Bering Sea; halibut in Eastern Bering Sea; Pacific Ocean perch off the State of Oregon, or better perhaps, George's Bank, or the red hake of the mid-Atlantic bight. These are immediate problems—crises if you will—and the United States through its upgraded fisheries office in the Department has been forced to move quickly.

We now have short term bi-lateral agreements with both the Soviet Union and Japan on the West Coast. They are not ideal to me—nor to the fishermen out on the West Coast—but then again neither are they welcome restrictions to the foreign fishermen offshore. But they are bringing a semblance of rational utilization and perhaps a degree of conservation into our adjacent fisheries.

On the Atlantic side, you will soon be meeting in Moscow on the second—and hopefully final—round of negotiations toward agreement on some of the dangerously low stocks—red hake, for example—in the mid-Atlantic bight. You will not come home with everything you seek but it is a beginning toward international understanding of proper use of our ocean resources. The Senate Committee on Commerce has taken a new and unusual interest in these negotiations and agreements. Senator Bartlett and I have gone to these countries and these meetings when our schedules permitted, and I believe the record will show that if we could not attend we have had a staff representative at every one in the last year and a half, including your Atlantic negotiations in Boston a few months ago and the discussions with Mexico in Washington, D.C., and then more recently in Mexico City. We, on the Senate Committee on Commerce, want to know what's happening here. We want to know of the progress. We want to be aware of the problems, for our interest in the fisheries of this nation will continue until America once again achieves its rightful place in the production and prestige of the world fisheries community.

At this point I would like to make a suggestion to those of you present, perhaps to the Boston Globe and those responsible for this First American Commercial Fish Exposition. My own experience in fishery negotia-

tions—and the reports from the Commerce Committee staff—have indicated very clearly to me the need for competent industry advisors at these meetings with other nations. I am not detracting from the knowledge or ability of our people in Government, but when you begin talking about specifics—the trades and compromises which unfortunately are always a part of the road to agreement—the particular expertise of the fishermen themselves, the processors, the people who will have to live with these agreements, is essential. As I mentioned earlier, the United States delegation will be journeying to Moscow soon hopefully to finalize an agreement with the Soviet Union on Atlantic fisheries, and I have been advised that many of those who need to be there will not be able to attend because their organizations lack the necessary funds. I will say no more about this—perhaps I have said too much already—but profits, if any, from this exposition could not be put to better use than in seeing that delegates from industry are in Moscow to provide the necessary local advice that our negotiators may be successful. Tom Fulham, sitting on this panel here today, can provide details better than I.

Let us look now at the problems of our own domestic fisheries. Why are we slipping in this world production picture? Why are imports constantly rising to take an even greater share of our expanding domestic market?

In my judgment, there is no better place to discuss the beginnings of this problem than right here in Boston. It was this industry which in the 1950's, following a reasonably prosperous era, found that the war-decimated fishing fleets of foreign nations were rapidly being replaced, and the catch of these modern vessels was finding its way into the American market at an alarming rate. The New England groundfish industry then made application to the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief. On two different occasions the Tariff Commission agreed with the petition of your industry, but the recommendation was rejected by Executive veto.

In an effort to partially meet this problem, the Congress passed the Act of June 12, 1960, the beginning of fishing vessel subsidies. This provided up to 33½ percent to help offset the cost of domestic construction as opposed to lower cost foreign shipyards. The law of 1793, of course, bans American fishermen the use of vessels over five net tons constructed in foreign yards.

Obviously, the answer to the problem of the New England groundfish fleets—and the fleets out on the Pacific Coast—would have been solved by adequate tariffs. It was equally apparent, however, that tariffs were not only unpopular but quite impossible in the Congress. I suppose the next approach might be some kind of quota arrangement whereby the American fishermen would be assured of a reasonable share of the U.S. market; or at least such increases which might be effected by advertising and promotion. But quotas are tariffs in a sense, and if we are to be realistic about these problems, the prospects are not too hopeful. In both the United States Senate and House of Representatives, at this moment, however, are groundfish quota bills, and I am included as a sponsor on one of these. Fishermen have long asked for such an effort, and I can promise you that we will give it our best, but again, any chance of success will be measured by the kind of support we may receive from those of you in the industry.

There have been many other legislative approaches to our problems, some successful, others which have failed. I have sponsored many of these, just as have your good representatives in the Congress from the Atlantic States.

One of these approaches, as I mentioned earlier, was the expansion of the original Fishing Fleet Improvement Act of 1964. This extended the subsidy program to other seg-

ments of the U.S. fishing fleets. Frankly, a good deal of the opposition to this extension of the subsidizing of fishing vessel construction came from my own State. It is equally interesting to note, however, that just in recent months I have received numerous letters from fishermen who, though they opposed our efforts in 1964, now see this as at least a partial solution to the problems of the American fisherman.

Early last year, I ordered a Commerce Committee survey of the commercial fishing industry on a number of subjects, including expressions on the question of vessel subsidies. The response on this question was more varied than on any other. Some favored the present program; a number asked amendments; a few asked that the law be repealed. Few, however, offered alternatives which in my judgment had such hope of passage in the Congress—particularly in times such as these when economy is the theme in Government.

Certainly one of the problems we have in the Congress is in securing some kind of consensus as to the needs of our American fishermen and industry. Although it is, to me, one of the most important segments of our economy, now and even more particularly in the future, it does not enjoy the same priority with the majority of the Congress. It is absolutely essential, then, that we receive the advice and counsel of those of you actively in the business—fishermen, processor, supplier—and it is my hope that in this panel discussion on subsidies this morning, that we may be able to determine some direction in this area which can be useful in our efforts in the Congress to achieve success in our common goal of returning American fisheries to their rightful place in the scale of world ocean harvest.

Thank you.

#### A HOPEFUL REPORT FROM VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report entitled "The Hopeful View From Saigon," by Dr. Edward W. Mill, chairman of the Chevalier Program in Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College, and an observer at the recent elections in South Vietnam.

The report is taken from the Los Angeles Times for Sunday, October 15, 1967:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE HOPEFUL VIEW FROM SAIGON

(NOTE.—Dr. Edward W. Mill, chairman of the Chevalier Program in Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College, has served in both governmental and academic capacities in Southeast Asia. He was most recently there in August and September to observe the national elections of Vietnam.)

(By Edward W. Mill)

On the way into Saigon from Tan Son Nhut airport, a route heavily lined with security installations, one suddenly notes the large billboard sign, "Welcome to Sunny Saigon!" This somewhat bland, tourist-type sign in English contrasts sharply with the rest of the martial air about Saigon. But it is also a reminder that while the war dominates there is also another side to Vietnam, and perhaps a more cheerful and slightly more optimistic one.

To those who witnessed the Sept. 3 elections in Vietnam, there was some reason to believe that a sunnier day could dawn for the republic in the days ahead.

The transitional government of Nguyen Van Thieu and Nguyen Cao Ky received a respectable endorsement from the voters as the future president and vice president of the republic. True, since election day, nu-

merous charges of fraud and intimidation have been heard from some of the defeated presidential candidates. Tri Quang and his Buddhist group have marshalled their forces to demand new elections, student groups have staged parades, and some uncertainty was cast for a while on the action to be taken by the Constituent Assembly in accepting or rejecting the results of the election.

But these negative factors hardly took away from the fact that the holding of the national elections had generally been a most significant event in the history of Vietnam and Southeast Asia. A look back at the elections, six weeks after, confirms this more than ever.

For some 27 years the people of Vietnam have been in conflict in one form or another, ranging from the days of World War II, to the fight against the French, to the present struggle between North and South Vietnam. Much of the time this has been a bitter and desperate struggle that has left little time for thoughts other than survival. Talk of democratic development somehow seemed very secondary when one's life was at stake or the life of the nation in doubt.

Moreover, democracy, as understood in the Western sense, was largely an alien concept with very few roots in Vietnamese soil. To combine winning a war with establishing democratic institutions was a task that seemed almost impossible; many today still think it cannot be accomplished. But somehow, beginning with Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954, the effort was made, and the results two decades afterwards are not unimpressive.

The years of Diem (1954-1963), mixed with both progress and acute controversy, were followed by years (1963-65) of instability. The "parade of the generals" began with Duong Van Hinh ("Big" Minh) on Nov. 1, 1963, continued with Nguyen Khanh from Feb. 8, 1964, to Oct. 26, 1964, and in June, 1965, brought Nguyen Cao Ky and Nguyen Van Thieu to power, respectively as prime minister and chief of state.

Whatever their imperfections, it cannot be denied that in the past two years the team of Thieu and Ky has brought some major advances in constitutional government to South Vietnam. In those two years, at least three significant steps have been taken. One was the move to develop a new constitution. This was marked by the election of Sept. 11, 1966, to form a Constituent Assembly to draft the constitution. The second step was the completion of the constitution in the spring of 1967 and its proclamation on April 1, 1967. The third major step was the holding of the recent national elections for president and vice president and the Senate. Oct. 22 will bring the windup of the process when the House of Representatives is elected.

More needs to be said about the new constitution of the Republic of Vietnam. Drafted by the elected Constituent Assembly, it is a democratic document that compares favorably with the other constitutions of Asia and is not too dissimilar from the American Constitution. It provides for the traditional separation of powers and the checks and balances of the American system. There are a president and vice president serving four year terms, a bicameral legislature consisting of a Senate elected for six year terms, and a House of Representatives elected for four year terms, and an independent judiciary.

Where a main difference occurs is in the Vietnamese provision for a prime minister. The prime minister is appointed by the president and responsible to him. Presidential powers, while strong and reflecting the wartime position of the country, are subject to important controls by the legislature.

Constitutions have often become scraps of paper in the developing nations of Asia and Africa. Or they have become so loaded with "emergency powers," loosely permitting executive rule and domination, that any pretense at democratic rule has soon gone out



the window. No one can predict in these early months that the new Vietnamese constitution will enjoy a better fate. But the developments of the past two years in South Vietnam, and especially of the past two months, give some grounds for modest hope that South Vietnam may have a constitution that could last for a while and perhaps for a long while. The best symbol of this hope thus far has been the national election of Sept. 3, 1967.

To express some hope for the future is not to concede that numerous serious problems do not still confront the Republic of Vietnam. At least five major problems will severely test the new government in the days ahead:

**The Progress of the War.** When all is said and done, the overriding factor in the present situation is the war. Without some continued progress, and perhaps even dramatic progress, any government in Saigon is going to have a very difficult time.

**Internal Unrest.** To a considerable extent, the Saigon government has had to fight the war with one hand tied behind its back. That hand has, in effect, been tied by various divisive groups, chiefly led by the Tri Quang Buddhist faction. Exhilarated by their success against Diem in 1963, they have subsequently been a thorn in the flesh of all succeeding governments.

In July, 1967, the Thieu government made an agreement recognizing the more moderate faction of the Unified Buddhist Church, led by Tam Chau, as the official Buddhist church. Tri Quang, already at odds with Thieu, has never forgiven him for this step.

The professedly non-political Tri Quang has become the most vocal political leader in Saigon. Just how the new government will deal with him and his allies in the future remains a big question. Meanwhile, it could be assumed that Viet Cong infiltrators and agents are missing no opportunity to fish in these troubled political waters.

**The Future Role of the Military.** Since the fall of 1963, South Vietnam has been run by a military government. The generals have become accustomed to the exercise of power. Will they now adapt themselves to the exercise of much greater civilian power? If the National Assembly should somehow engage in major resistance to the leadership of Thieu and Ky, how will the military take it? If the Tri Quang group and other dissidents engage in massive defiance of the government, what will be the military response?

During the campaign, Thieu declared that at least 50 officers were under investigation on charges of corruption. How will the armed forces react to any sweeping house-cleaning of their ranks? There are ample reasons to believe that the military may prove thin-skinned in many of these matters and in no mood to see their power base eliminated. Some also professed to see in the Military Council and in the National Security Council, both provided for in the constitution, possible new devices for military control of the civilian authority. Presidential control of these agencies might, however, minimize any military bid for dominance.

**Ky Versus Thieu.** One of the favorite items of speculation in Saigon this summer was how long Marshal Ky would work with Gen. Thieu in the post-election period. Their basic animosity and rivalry appeared to be taken for granted by many people. If Ky should somehow find his vice presidential role confining and degrading, it was assumed that he might be tempted to join with some like-minded military brethren to remove Thieu.

But some of this random speculation may be just that: random. Both men have had a vested interest in the success of the new constitution, developed during their time in office. They have also achieved a formal victory at the polls. Their main activities have come under an international microscope in recent months. There are thus many reasons why they may work together effectively to get the new government off the ground.

**Legislative Responsibility?** The new National Assembly of Vietnam will have the

greatest powers given to any legislative body in the history of Vietnam. It will also be a legislative body in which many will be gaining their first legislative experience. Just how the legislature and the legislators will respond to their newly gained status is one of the main unanswered questions. Not only will there be a need for the full utilization of constitutionally granted powers, but there will also be a need for responsible performance.

North Vietnam hardly has to worry about these matters. There are no real elections in the Communist-run state; no one would be so silly as to propose them. There are no political parties except the master one. Executive-legislative cooperation is mainly automatic. What South Vietnam is attempting would be inconceivable in North Vietnam.

For these reasons, Hanoi was openly anxious about the success of the electoral process in the south, and the Viet Cong did all they could to discredit the elections and the government. During election week, they killed 190 civilians, wounded 426, and kidnapped 237 persons. Despite their all-out campaign of terrorism against South Vietnamese voters, they failed: 83% of those registered actually voted Sept. 3. The North Vietnamese pattern hardly seemed to be what the people of South Vietnam wanted.

The new government of South Vietnam faces a need for fresh and vigorous leadership. Thieu and Ky must seek to form a broadly-based government, which provides the opposition with meaningful recognition. It must also provide leadership for a people that is war-weary and numb after years of conflict. The attitudes of Hanoi do not offer much hope for realistic negotiation, but Thieu is committed to a full exploration of all possibilities. His government must also work to build a stronger and more effective way. The pacification effort in the villages must be improved. The government must become more of a visible symbol of economic and social progress for all the people of Vietnam.

In two years the people and government of the Republic of Vietnam have made some impressive strides towards constitutional government. Can they now implement this initial success and bring about a better and enduring republic? The world is watching.

### HOMEOWNERSHIP

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, George Sternlieb, author of a housing study in Newark, N.J., "The Tenement Landlord," has had an article on homeownership published in the October issue of Transaction magazine. His article, entitled "The Case for the Tenant as Owner," indicates that homeownership has advantages for the neighborhood. In his study of Newark, Sternlieb examined the conditions of housing in the city and found that maintenance quality had a direct relation with ownership. To quote his results.

Where you have an owner-resident in a tenement you will get good maintenance. Where you do not have an owner-resident in a tenement, you are not going to have good maintenance.

This is just one more piece of evidence on the need to broaden our housing policy to include a program of homeownership for lower income families. This seems to be the one "missing link" in our policy. Congresswoman SULLIVAN established the opening wedge last year with her program that created the 221(h) program. Now, we need to broaden the opportunities for homeownership.

Hopefully, we will pass legislation this session that will accomplish this. There are two approaches for us, both of which should be enacted into law. There is the FHA program, which will provide sales housing for the lower income family, and there is a program introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] which will make public housing units eligible for purchase.

Mr. President, the St. Paul Dispatch in an editorial indicates that this latter program has a great deal of merit and that it should be given full hearings this session. I, too, agree that this program has advantages, so that hearings for it should be held at the first feasible moment. If what Sternlieb says is true, the owner-resident concept should be instituted in public housing as soon as possible.

However, we must always keep in mind that homeownership programs, whether they concentrate on sales housing through the FHA, condominium ownership of existing units, or conversion of public housing projects, are not a panacea for the ills of the cities. The belief that homeownership will act as a magic wand, changing the dismal ghettos into suburban neighborhoods, is a false illusion. What homeownership programs will do, however, is to expand the opportunities available to the lower-income person as he seeks a safe and decent dwelling for his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Public Housing for Sale," published in the St. Paul Dispatch, and George Sternlieb's article, "The Case for the Tenant as Owner," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PUBLIC HOUSING FOR SALE

A number of bills are before Congress that would provide federal assistance for low income families to purchase their own homes.

One highly publicized proposal involves the merging of plans of Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota and Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois designed to make conventional home loans available to the poor through existing federal agencies. A special national home ownership foundation would be created to promote the program.

The theory is that home ownership helps build a sense of responsibility and pride and that slums can be rebuilt and communities revitalized through this approach.

Home ownership, of course, is not a panacea for the ills of the slums. But it should be part of an overall attack on the slums and the ghettos.

However there is another bill in Congress which has received less attention and could be just as far reaching in its impact as the Mondale-Percy measure. Sen. Mondale is a sponsor of this bill, too, along with Sen. Joseph Tydings of Maryland. It would allow poor people to purchase their public housing units (homes or apartments) when their incomes improve.

Co-sponsored by Rep. Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, the bill would allow the tenant to purchase the unit on extended terms—monthly payments not exceeding 20 per cent of the purchaser's income. For example, a family earning \$4,200 a year would not pay more than \$70 a month. Public housing projects, Sen. Tydings says, need no longer be considered as temporary dwellings or as a "shelter for failure." Allowing successful

families to remain would encourage others, he believes.

Coupled with this measure would be funds to rehabilitate and modernize the housing projects (an estimated \$5 million the first year) and proposals to promote resident organizations to foster self government within public housing units.

It is an idea that has a great deal of merit and should get a thorough airing in Congress this session.

#### THE CASE FOR THE TENANT AS OWNER

(By George Sternlieb, director, research center, Graduate School of Business Administration, Rutgers)

The element I would like to focus on is the alienation between owner and tenant. Tenants are typically living in multiple-family residences in the slum areas that I know of, and they typically do not own these parcels. Not only do they not own them, but the people who own them are strangers. They are not uncommonly strangers in color and in speech—and this holds true, by the way, whether these strangers are people from the public housing administration or the local slum landlords. Tenants feel no great desire or obligation to maintain these parcels.

Any effort at rehabilitation that does not involve the enthusiasm and the basic guts involvement and agreement of the tenants is just transitory. Such an effort appeases the middle-class conscience, but has no lasting effect.

The research that we have just recently completed—which I would guess is the occasion for my being called here—is in the study, *The Tenement Landlord*. Our goal was to define who owns the tenements and what makes them tick and, even more adequately, how can we make them tick in a fashion which is appropriate to the way society wants them to tick.

We analyzed condition of parcel, tax aspect, financing, ownership patterns. We took 566 tenements for the study in a random structured sample. We got depth interviews with approximately 70 percent of the owners of all the parcels. When we cross-tabulated the results of all we got, there was only one factor which makes for good maintenance—the owner-resident. Where you have an owner-resident in a tenement you will get good maintenance. Where you do not have an owner-resident in a tenement, you are not going to have good maintenance.

Newark, the area that we were working in, has the largest portion of nonwhite population of any major Northern city with the possible exception of Washington. There are a growing number of Negro landlords. (I would suggest, by the way, that cities like Newark and a couple of the other major Northern industrial towns are deserving of intensive study because they are front-runners. They are a vision of things to come. Their problems are the problems which the bulk of the other Northern cities will be experiencing over the next 10 or 15 years.) In Newark there are a growing number of Negro landlords. They are typically resident landlords whose size of family or income level has kept them out of public housing. Or they may be just people who want to buy a house because they want to own something, and the only house they can afford is a tenement house which will bring in some rent to hopefully cover the mortgage.

I would like to suggest that there is more hope for lasting rehabilitation, for providing model leadership to the community, for a genuine upgrading of the life styles of the urban poor in this and similar owner-resident patterns than there is in any externally imposed uplifting pattern. But how do we move toward new forms of ownership?

I think it has to be understood that most of the current attitudes toward the slums are reflective of past conditions rather than present facts. Basic among the facts of the case is the fact that the slum real estate

market is weakening radically. If this offends the concept of slumlords and the profitability of slums, I am afraid it will have to. What has happened is that there has been a tremendous outmigration, not merely of whites, but also of nonwhites as well. This is perhaps more true of a city like Newark, whose environs provide much more in the way of open housing, than may be the case in other major cities, but I would suggest that again Newark is a front-runner here.

In the course of a study which we recently completed, I had occasion to interview a whole series of churchmen, all of whom had congregations in the central city. When we interviewed the white churchmen, the pattern which we got was pretty much what we had anticipated—a substantial number [of the members] have basically switched their affiliation to suburban churches. . . .

On the other hand, when we interviewed Negro mainline ministers—and by "mainline ministers" I am referring to the African Methodist and Abyssinian Baptist groups—we got very much the same pattern. For these main-line ministers in the central city were discovering that their nonwhite congregations also were moving out, that not uncommonly as much as half of their congregations on a typical Sunday were no longer residents of the central city.

Now this has weakened the slum tenement market. When the market weakens, when the demand goes down, the owner has a variety of choices. What we would like him to do probably is cut rents and possibly improve his parcel so that he will be more competitive. But there is a third choice, and that is to cut your maintenance—assuming you have been doing any—to the bone, get what little is left out of the parcel, put in as little as you possibly can, and if you start getting too many violations, walk away.

It is this last pattern of behavior which we are getting. We are getting it in Newark, in New York City, and in many other major urban centers. The cry goes out for code enforcement, and code enforcement obviously is essential; but not uncommonly, when you put the screws on for code enforcement, what you get are one of three patterns of conduct. One pattern is the one that you would really like: People fix up the parcel. That is fine. Another pattern is that people avoid the code one way or another. The third pattern is that people abandon the parcel, and, in a weak market, there is a tendency toward abandonment. . . .

If you do get code enforcement, not infrequently you get it at the cost of raising rents and driving the poor out. So we have a very complicated picture before us. . . .

We have examined and interviewed in detail a number of these new [tenant-] owners. I would like to focus on these people, because I think they have great promise for the future and I think they need a lot of help.

How do these people buy a parcel? We examined the sales of parcels in terms of their assessments, in terms of their values, and what we see is the new owner not atypically paying anywhere from 150 to 200 percent of what the going market is for his tenement. Very frequently he does not even know how much he has paid for it. He buys it the way he buys a car. How much is the down payment? What are the monthly payments? The inflated price would not be so bad, except that it typically is covered by short-term mortgages, and these are purchase-money mortgages. There is no legitimate financing in the hard-core slum areas. Bankers and savings and loan presidents continually have meetings in which they pledge that they will be putting up funds in the future, that there is no such thing as a blacklist. The records call them liars.

There are only purchase-money mortgages. These purchase-money mortgages come either from the former slum landlord or from money sharks. In the several hundred mort-

gages that we examined, none of them are for periods of over 10 years. The amortization is murderous. There are at least a couple of landlords that we examined who were using the "yo-yo" principle, if you will forgive our inventing a phrase. The yo-yo principle is very simple. You take the 500 bucks that a Puerto Rican or Negro can scrape together. You put enough paper on his parcel so that it sinks in two or three years. You take back the parcel and you look around for another sucker. Not all of them are this way. There are some, however, who are.

The new landlord and his acquisition are further victimized by every fast-talking home improvement specialist in the country. One of my field people used the phrase "the storm-window syndrome," because we saw so many of them. You go through the slums and you have a whole bunch of houses that are pretty much stuck together with asphalt and prayer, and in the midst of these you find a house with new storm windows—those very fancy aluminum three-way combinations. Not infrequently it will have a new roof and a new everlasting siding job. . . .

In the course of this tenement landlord study, I interviewed a big-time money lender specializing in first and second mortgages—not a bad guy. He said, "You know, every time I take one of those parcels back—and I don't want to take them back any more, I used to be in that business, but I am not in that business any more—I want to get out. Every time I take one of them back, the poor guy comes in here and he is carrying the books."

I asked him what he meant by "the books." He was referring to payment books; on all of these installment things you are given something that looks like a Christmas club book so you can keep tabs on your payments. This money lender pulled open his desk drawer, and it was filled with these books that had bounced back with the parcels that he had had to retake because he called his own major mortgages. These are a reflection of the pride that these new owners have in their parcels. These may be the first things of significance they have ever owned, and in their pride they are open for unscrupulous salesmanship.

The new owner needs guidance. I have suggested in the study, and I would suggest here, that there may be considerable mileage in the equivalent of what the U.S. government did for western lands under the Homestead Act. Basically what we did was turn to people who did not have very much money but had a fair degree of muscle, and say, "If you settle on a piece of government-owned land, you improve the land, and you live there over a period of years, we will provide you with inexpensive financing and, through the county agent system of the Agriculture Department, with guidance, and if you can stick it out, you can end up owning something." And it worked.

I think that what we need here in the central-core city is some means of providing a piece of the action—ownership for the poor. I think we are going to need more adequate financing than is presently available.

If for the moment, I can wax back into my collegiate role, there is a very basic theory which I do not think has ever been disproven. When you have a whole series of legislation on one point and the same point comes up year after year after year, it means that legislation is not working. So in the financing of rehabilitation, we have had enough FHA numbers to fill a small telephone book. I would suggest in their sheer redundancy, in the sheer number of them, we confess that we are not getting a heck of a lot of mileage out of it. . . .

We are going to need financing for rehabilitation, and it is going to have to be a lot more sensible than some of the FHA requirements for rehabilitation presently. . . .

We are going to need an advisory service,



and let me stress an advisory service, not a service telling people what to do, because . . . the time for telling people what to do in the central city is pretty much over. . . .

In closing, there is no one magic wand that is going to create a new life for the people in the city, and similarly there certainly is no magic wand which is going to recreate the city. I would suggest that the home ownership pattern may be a very small step but I think perhaps a very positive step in that direction. The urgency of this situation I do not think has been made clear. And I am not talking about people getting out in the streets and rioting, though that may well happen.

The urgency basically is the fact that as the market weakens in the city, as its functions are lost, you get into a degenerative spiral. A good deal of the business of the city is taking in each other's wash, so you have a dynamism here, and that dynamism is going down hill. . . .

### THE YELLOW PERIL ISSUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is useful for us to know the background of the recently used and much abused phrase "yellow peril." Some have laid at Secretary of State Dean Rusk's door the responsibility for having again raised the yellow peril issue, but the Secretary has done no such thing. In his remarks, Secretary Rusk made no racial references to Asian peoples, but to the numbers under the thumb of international communism and to the numbers of Asians threatened by this ideology.

Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, October 21, pointed out that the yellow peril issue was laid to rest long ago, in fact, shortly after it was raised in 1907. Secretary of State Rusk has not resurrected it. His critics, who have done so, have done a disservice, I believe. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lincoln's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### YELLOW PERIL LAID TO REST LONG AGO

(By Gould Lincoln)

Sixty years ago Rep. Richmond Pearson Hobson of Alabama, a Navy hero, day in and day out in Congress blasted the Japanese as a threat to the security of the United States. Out of Hobson's speeches and his writings grew the phrase "yellow peril."

Hobson's "yellow peril" of 1907 has nothing in common with Secretary of State Dean Rusk's warning of the threat of international communism to the security of the United States and the non-Communist countries of Southeast Asia and the Pacific nor with his defense of this country's war against the Communists in Vietnam, North and South. But for political reasons the cry of "yellow peril," with its implied racial overtones, has been tied to Rusk's statement by members of Congress—especially Senator Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., and some columnists—all of whom should know better.

It is to be presumed that Senator McCarthy knew the facts about Hobson and his "yellow peril" speeches and warnings, even though McCarthy was not born until nine years after Hobson had been sounding off in the halls of Congress and elsewhere. There is no slightest doubt that Hobson was warning that the yellow races of Asia, led by the Japanese, constituted a real danger to the United States—that a racial conflict was involved. But McCarthy and the others now shouting "yellow peril" in their attacks on

Rusk must know that the secretary of State, was warning not against the yellow race but against international communism; that he was speaking in defense of a billion members of the yellow race against possible and probable aggression by the Communists if the United States should quit its defense of the anti-Communist people of South Vietnam.

Rusk was prompted in a denial that there was anything racial involved in his assertion that the safety of the United States and of the free nations of Asia is at stake. And properly so. The "yellow peril" criticisms, however, whether so designed or not, could only rouse resentment against the United States in the minds of Indians, Malaysians, Japanese, the people of Thailand, Burma, etc., unless the truth were brought out.

That, apparently, means nothing to the opponents of the war in Vietnam. The aim of many of them is not only to get us out of Vietnam—at any cost—but to get Lyndon Johnson out of the White House. First, to deny him renomination for President, and if that fails, to defeat him for reelection.

Japan, at the time of Hobson's "yellow peril" diatribes, had emerged as a strong military and naval power in the Far East. It had defeated China in the war in 1894-5. And ten years later, in 1904-5, it had defeated Russia, on sea and on land. It had, and was in the process of building, a navy rated only after the British and American navies. Hobson argued that Japan would win the backing of China in a war of "Asia for the Asians." There was one angle to Hobson's fears for the United States that was outside racial lines, however. He spoke out bitterly against the British who had entered into a military alliance with Japan—he called it "an unholy alliance," which might lead Britain to side with the Japanese if they undertook to run us out of the Pacific. At that time we held the Philippines and Hawaii. Hobson claimed the Japanese were in a position to take both in a sudden attack, and the United States would not have heard anything about it until word came by ship, some ten days later.

Theodore Roosevelt was President. He had announced his policy of "speaking softly and carrying a big stick"—although he did not always speak softly. At times, too, he waved "the big stick." Early in his administration, he forced Kaiser Wilhelm II and a Tory government in Britain to arbitrate claims they had against Venezuela. The Germans were threatening to send naval forces into Venezuela. Roosevelt gave the Kaiser ten days in which to withdraw the order, or he, Roosevelt, would send Admiral Dewey and his fleet to blow the Germans out of the water. Further, Roosevelt had used his influence, by then becoming worldwide, to bring Russia and Japan to a peace table at Portsmouth, and there he steered them to a peace treaty which neither of them liked. He received, not a military medal, but the Nobel "Peace Prize." Also, Roosevelt sent an American fleet around the world.

The consequence was the American people, with some exceptions, put their faith in "Teddy" Roosevelt, and paid little attention to Hobson's "yellow peril." Hobson, a graduate of the Naval Academy, with seven volunteers, took the collier Merrimack into Santiago Harbor during our war with Spain, and sank it. Later he received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

### EFFECTIVENESS OF F-111 AIRCRAFT SYSTEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, two very penetrating and objective articles have been published recently about the effectiveness of the F-111 aircraft system. Knowing of the interest of Senators in this matter, I ask unanimous consent

that the articles be printed in the RECORD. One is by Jim Lucas of Scripps-Howard, the other by Henry Keys, of the Pueblo, Colo., Chieftain.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1967]

"THIS IS THE ONE WE'VE BEEN WAITING FOR":  
F-111 IS "ONE HELL OF AN AIRCRAFT"

(NOTE.—Much has been written about the controversial F-111, formerly the TFX, soon to be sent to Vietnam. But how do the men who will fly it feel about this plane which has created such a storm in Congress and the Pentagon? Jim G. Lucas, just back from Vietnam, spent three days this week looking at the plane and talking to the men who fly it. This is his report.)

(By Jim G. Lucas)

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV., October 20.—The desert air was crisp and clear when Col. Ivan Dethman brought her gently down, too new even to have a tail number.

"This is the one we've been waiting for," said Air Force M/Sgt. Charles Hennessee, who heads a 35-man maintenance crew—"the one with all the bugs out."

This—at 1:32 on a Tuesday afternoon—was not just another landing. It was an historic event. This—the 31st F-111 built and flown—was the first production model off the General Dynamics assembly line at Ft. Worth. It could revolutionize flying. Or it could turn out to be a \$5 billion dud.

An Air Force F-111 crashed yesterday near Bowie in northeast Texas. The two crewmen—General Dynamics employees—ejected safely. But Air Force men concede such mishaps are inevitable, and this one is not likely to alter the basic confidence in the F-111 that I found among the men at Nellis.

"We make or break the F-111 right here," Maj. Al Sonnett said.

The controversial F-111 program was budgeted at the outset at \$5 billion; it will come to more than that. Each Air Force F-111A was ticketed at \$2.8 million. No. 31 cost \$5 million. The Navy F-111B, still a year and a half away, will cost \$8 million.

The F-111 contract award to General Dynamics was opposed by some who favored Boeing. It has been called the biggest blunder of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who has pushed it with singleminded intensity. The Navy has never been happy about being dragged into the program; a Chief of Naval Operations who told Congress so, was fired by the late President Kennedy. Sen. Karl Mundt (R., S.D.), wonders why the landing brakes don't work better than they do.

The Marines have backed off, claiming they don't need the F-111, but the British are in to the tune of \$786 million, and so are the Aussies.

"All that has been said about this aircraft before it arrived at Nellis is no concern of ours," says Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, head of the Air Force Tactical Weapons Center. "Our job is to prove or disprove its capabilities."

Gen. Taylor has flown the plane, and he says:

"This is one hell of an aircraft we've got here. I tell my men—and they've read a lot and are confused—'Don't knock it until you've flown it.' After you've flown it, you're hooked."

"It gives us a capability we've always needed, but lacked, in the Tactical Air Force. The successes we're having with it are unprecedented."

With a note of realism, Gen. Taylor adds, "sooner or later, we'll lose one—that's inevitable—and because it will be an F-111, and because a lot of people are emotionally com-

mitted against it—there'll be an uproar, there'll be a lot of 'I told you so.' But that won't prove anything."

There can be no doubting the enthusiasm here. In the officers club the talk is even more enthusiastic, if that is possible, than on the flight line.

"I'll tell you this," Sgt. Hennessee says, "I helped bring the F-4 into the Air Force in 1963, and I wouldn't want to go back."

There are six F-111s in Nellis, Nos. 26 thru 31. The others are elsewhere in the Air Force training and research system. The first five here were hand-built, and there were problems. For one thing, after 1450 miles per hour, they tended to surge and stall. There have been two stalls here, but Gen. Taylor points out, "We've had a worse stall in the F-105."

There were problems with brakes. Treetop speed levels are questionable.

"Surging and stalling have been licked," says George I. Davis of Ft. Worth, the General Dynamics representative here. "The thing now is to incorporate the changes into the production models."

Recent Congressional testimony was that treetop level speeds are one-third of that guaranteed.

"I'll be honest with you," Gen. Taylor grins. "I don't know that was guaranteed. But as a flier I'll say we are eminently satisfied with this bird's speed at all levels."

Col. Dethman flew No. 31 the 1047 miles from Ft. Worth to Las Vegas on automatic pilot—"I touched the controls on landing and takeoff."

"I never missed a turning point by more than a foot or a yard," he said. "It was unbelievable."

George Stonehouse, British Minister of Aviation and a former RAF pilot, flew an F-111.

"It's perfect," he said as he climbed out of the cockpit.

All the men flying the F-111 are Vietnam veterans, and many were skeptical at first.

"Ken Blank came in with a negative attitude," says Lt. Col. Bobby Mead, commanding the 4481st Fighter Squadron. "He's positive now."

Maj. Kenneth Blank, admits he was doubtful: "Who isn't when he's given a new toy to play with?" Maj. Blank was the first F-105 pilot to bag a MIG in North Vietnam.

"I like this bird," he says. "When I came back from over there, all I knew about it I'd read in the papers, and that wasn't good. It has the best avionics I've ever seen. I'm doing things with it I've never done before."

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, Oct. 12, 1967]

**HOT DEBATE CONTINUES: HAVE THE F-111'S CRITICS OVERSTATED THEIR CASE?**

(By Henry Keys)

WASHINGTON.—The F111A—the most hotly debated aircraft since the B52—becomes operational within a matter of days.

This achievement is unlikely, however, to cool down the fierce controversy that has raged throughout the five years it has taken to develop the highly unusual plane to combat-ready status.

Which is unfortunate, for when all's said and done, the F111A—Air Force version of the six-member F111 family—promises to be the most revolutionary and widely capable fighting flying machine ever built.

Witness the fact that Britain and Australia are so impressed with it they rushed to place orders, Britain for 50 and Australia for 24.

Yet there are those who still condemn the F111, like Chairman John L. McClellan, D-Ark., of the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee.

McClellan says the whole family of F111 planes is falling far short of expectations and costing more than twice as much as antici-

pated. "The prospects for the F111A are better than for the others," he adds, "but it is never going to be the plane they thought they were going to get."

#### CONDEMNS NAVY VERSION

It is the Navy's version of the plane, the F111B, that has incurred the greatest congressional wrath.

"A dog," it has been called by Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Ohio, a member of the House subcommittee on defense appropriations.

To stand off and look back at the political infighting that has raged around the F111 program from its inception is to come to the conclusion that it is coming off the production line, ready for service, almost solely because of the dogged determination of one man—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

It is clear, too, that the row about it is due also to the actions of McNamara.

The dispute over the plane boiled over in Congress, in the Pentagon and in the aircraft industry. It was reminiscent of the explosive fight which erupted in the 1950's over the long-range B52 bomber.

The storm burst in 1962 when McNamara enraged Congress by (1) giving the go-ahead to develop the plane, (2) by the nature of ground rules he established for its design, and (3) by his decision to award the contract for its development and production to General Dynamics Corporation, of Fort Worth, Texas, when his own Defense Department experts unanimously said the contract should go to the Boeing Company.

He aroused inter-service ire particularly in the Navy, by insisting that the plane, then called the TFX or "tactical" fighter experimental, should serve both Air Force and the Navy.

#### ELIMINATE WASTE

The "commonality" thus achieved, he said, would result in a single weapon system capable of use by different services for different missions—would avoid the wastefulness of a multiplicity of weapons serving similar ends and result in an eventual saving of \$1 billion.

Congress and the services joined forces to go after McNamara's scalp. The "commonality" concept was not only impractical but nonsensical, the argument ran.

McClellan set out to prove this, and also that McNamara had been guilty of something unsavory in giving General Dynamics the contract over Boeing. He held committee hearings which amassed 3,000 pages of testimony and provoked McNamara to protest that the committee inquiry was impugning his integrity.

The committee never has produced a report or published any findings, but today, four years later, McClellan and others are still hot after McNamara on the issue.

Actually, though, developers have hit close to their "commonality" target. On design and construction of the "A" and "B", 80 percent of the aircraft components and 27 percent of the electronic gear components are identical.

#### BEHIND SCHEDULE

So far as the program is concerned, the critics have hit where it really hurts—the lagging development of the Navy's F111B.

Production of the first combat-ready F111B already is 2½ years behind schedule because of innumerable difficulties in developing the basic design to aircraft carrier requirements.

Unfortunately, the troubles with the "B" have obscured from the general public the dramatic progress made with the "A", and, indeed, the astonishing nature of both aircraft.

As Air Force Col. Alfred L. Esposito, assistant for F111 programs, says, "We are flying in areas where no one has ever flown before and no one else is even attempting to fly today."

Precise figures relating to speed, altitude and range are top secret. But it is known it is

a supersonic aircraft, with a top speed in the order of 2½ times the speed of sound, or in excess of 1,500 miles an hour. It will be able to fly without refueling to either Europe or Asia.

It can fly at treetop level, under enemy radar, at supersonic speeds, just as it can at altitudes in excess of 80,000 feet.

It is a superbly effective weapon, able to deal with enemy aircraft as effectively as it can place bombs and missiles on ground targets.

#### OEO AND THE RIOTS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, this summer witnessed a score of riots and disturbances in our cities. This was one of the most painful experiences this Nation has undergone. We saw American soldiers battle their fellow citizens and watched as our cities were turned into armed camps. This postriot autumn should be a time of reflection and contemplation, a time in which we attempt to devise programs and strategies to deal with the immediate and long-term causes of the riots.

However, there has been a tendency not to do this, but rather, to fall prey to the temptation to find a scapegoat for the riots. There are always those, who, in times of crisis, prefer to find a scapegoat rather than face the reality of the situation. To these people, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the scapegoat. This is a new agency, with new programs, and without a powerful constituency. It is therefore in a weak position and has been subject to much criticism. It is ironic that this agency, which is dedicated to dealing with the roots of the riots—poverty, ignorance, unemployment, and depravation—has been chosen by these people as a focal point for resting blame for the riots.

The July 31 issue of Barron's magazine contains an article entitled "Poverty Warriors" which catalogs most of the charges that have been made against the Office of Economic Opportunity with regard to the riots. Upon reading this article, I was most disturbed to see a publication of the caliber of Barron's report such a story. I immediately contacted the Office of Economic Opportunity for a report on the allegations made in this magazine. I have now received this report, and it notes that the charges made by Barron's are not substantiated when the facts are explained.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the Barron's article, my correspondence, and the report of the Office of Economic Opportunity be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is something terribly wrong with this country when a dedicated agency is singled out for abusive and false criticism, when the same agency is denied a pay raise because its policies are objectionable to some Members of Congress. Mr. President, I hope that this issue-by-issue refutation of the charges against the Office of Economic Opportunity will assist in clarifying the role of the agency and point up the work that it has done to prevent riots, not to cause them.

There being no objection, the material



was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Barron's, July 31, 1967]

**POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED**

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a \$50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top anti-poverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted \$700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smoldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by

experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war of poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive troublemaking potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from \$246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated \$500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harawitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

AUGUST 24, 1967.

Mr. GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,  
Assistant Director for Congressional Relations,  
Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MCCARTHY: Enclosed you will find a copy of an article which appeared in Barron's magazine on the 31st of July this year. As you will note, this article is quite critical on the War on Poverty and alleges that OEO has subsidized the recent riots.

I would appreciate it if you could compile a report on the allegations made in this article and send to the attention of John Maguire of my staff.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,

October 10, 1967.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter of August 24 with regard to the Barron's article of July 31, 1967. I am sorry for the delay in our reply.

Enclosed is a list of Barron's charges and the facts, which show the false presentation of this article concerning "OEO's connection with the riots."

If you should have any further questions please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,

Assistant Director  
for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
Washington, D.C.

BARRON'S ARTICLE, JULY 31, 1967

The July 31st issue of Barron's, a financial weekly, carried an article attacking the Office of Economic Opportunity: "Poverty Warriors: The Riots are Subsidized as Well as Organized."

The article attempts to line those engaged in the task of fighting poverty with the riots that have appalled the Nation. No attempt is made to be objective or thorough in presentation. Instead, a collection of incidents and allegations are strung together to try to discredit the anti-poverty program.

The following is a list of charges made and the facts which are readily available to all.

**CHARGE**

The riots are subsidized. "Thanks to OEO, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction."

**ANSWER**

No riot is subsidized—by OEO or any other government agency. War on Poverty programs are squarely on the side of law and order. Instead of fomenting disorder, OEO workers are doing all they can to cool things down. Since the overwhelming majority of anti-poverty workers actually live in areas where disorders could, or did occur, the surprising fact is that so few were involved in disturbances.

OEO gathered statistics on 32 cities in which riots occurred this summer. Anti-poverty workers, i.e., employees of OEO-funded agencies, in these cities number 30,565. Only 16 of the 13,050 persons arrested in these 32 cities were paid anti-poverty workers. Only six of these were full-time staff mem-

bers, nine were summer employees, and one was a VISTA.

Most public officials, contrary to *Barron's* view, have lauded the poverty program for being an effective weapon against riots.

Hugh J. Addonizio, Mayor of Newark, said, right after his city's riots: "It is my position that anti-poverty programs have been helpful to my city, and that these programs need to be greatly expanded . . . I support the program and all it has done to bring hope to many . . ." Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta wired,

"Recreational funds and EOA CAP centers have contributed greatly to cooling off summer problems. CAP center and personnel provided quick communications facility for easing the explosive situation in the Dixie Hills disturbance."

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, Rhode Island, told a group of poverty workers: "As far as I am concerned there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys." Mayor Robert M. L. Johnson, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, said: "The Community Action Program here, . . . was in a great degree responsible for a calmness and sensibility throughout the Negro community some days ago when most of the white community panicked because of rumors of riot . . . as a result Cedar Rapids did not have any incidents despite the fact that for four days this community was blanketed with every conceivable rumor of race riot potential."

From the Chief of Police of Little Rock, Arkansas: ". . . we have detected a considerable decrease in the vandalism and destruction of property . . . in the poverty areas of our city . . . It is obvious to me that a good portion of this reduction can be attributed directly to the . . . various programs conducted under OEO."

And for one last example, Mayor Sorenson of Omaha wrote to Mr. Shriver: "As you are well aware, Omaha's 'long hot summer' has been kept 'cool' to date by programs we have initiated with your help."

#### CHARGE

The riots are organized. A Cleveland grand jury has found that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion."

#### ANSWER

No responsible person or organization has found that the riots are organized or planned subversion. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has testified that the FBI has found no evidence that the disorders were organized. The Cleveland grand jury heard a great many charges and allegations, but it refused to return a single indictment.

#### CHARGE

Marion Barry is a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Rufus Mayfield is a Black Muslim who has spent most of his last eight years in prison. Together they have found gainful employment working for UPO, the top anti-poverty agency in Washington. (The implication is that OEO hires subversives and dangerous criminals.)

#### ANSWER

The article identifies Marion Barry as a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Mr. Barry never held such a post. He was former head of the Washington, D.C. branch of SNCC, and resigned sometime ago to devote more time to District affairs. As head of the Free D.C. Movement, Mr. Barry has taken an active role in efforts to bring Home Rule to the District, to increase jobs for minority groups, to oppose transit increase and to fight the blight and decay—both spiritual and physical—of Washington slums.

Because of Mr. Barry's demonstrated ability to effectively organize young people and

channel their energies in constructive channels, he has been employed by the United Planning Organization, the District's anti-poverty agency, to help this group in its work with young people. A national magazine recently said of Mr. Barry: "Barry, after breaking with his SNCC cohorts, is now the mastermind for youth programs in the anti-poverty division and is quietly showing intellectuals how to communicate."

While it is true that Rufus Mayfield has been in trouble with the law, he has been operating what is regarded nationally as an extremely successful anti-poverty effort, hiring more than 1,000 poverty-stricken youths for a neighborhood clean-up program in Washington, D.C. This program, fittingly named "PRIDE", has been so effective—as an example, it killed some 10,000 rats in less than three weeks—that even those who first expressed doubts about the feasibility of the project, are now counted among its warmest supporters. So successful has the project been that the Labor Department has refunded it on a year-round basis. One additional note—Mr. Mayfield is working for the Labor Department, not UPO.

#### CHARGE

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA) received \$700,000 from OEO despite the fact that it numbers among its principals such "subversives" as John Zippert and Shirley Mesher.

#### ANSWER

SWAFCA was granted \$400,000 by OEO, not \$700,000 as *Barron's* erroneously reports. Furthermore, neither Shirley Mesher nor John Zippert is a "principal" or even a member of the cooperative. SWAFCA, incidentally, is a coop project whose membership is composed primarily of poor Negro farmers, who are being provided help to raise their incomes through their own labors.

#### CHARGE

OEO has jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Two examples are John Ross, of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on the anti-poverty board in San Francisco; and Howard Harawitz, a former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, who serves on a similar anti-poverty board in Berkeley.

#### ANSWER

This is a classic example of brutal character assassination. First, neither of these men was on the "federal payroll." Board members serve on a volunteer basis—without pay.

Second, neither of the above organizations, despite the radical beliefs expressed by some of their members, is included on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Finally, OEO has strictly enforced rules and regulations covering the subject of subversives and character qualifications both for board members and for employees.

"Membership in subversive organizations or lack of sympathy with the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, are inconsistent with membership on the governing bodies and police advisory committees of community action agencies. Moreover, all members of such bodies and committees shall be persons of good character; recent conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude shall be considered strong evidence of failure to meet this standard."

Another memorandum, No. 23-A, covers the question of employees:

"Membership in the Communist Party or in any other organization whose objectives include the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence is inconsistent with employment in a community action program."

These memorandum clearly spell out OEO's policy on membership in subversive organizations and in the absence of any proof from *Barron's* that they are being violated, it can

only be assumed that the magazine is more interested in attacking the program, than it is in getting at the truth.

#### CHARGE

New York City's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, was investigated by federal and state officials which found several staff members who were also members of the Communist Party.

#### ANSWER

*Barron's* goes back to 1964 to attack New York's Mobilization for Youth project. The program is not, and never was a "pilot project for the Job Corps." Contrary to what the article says, investigation of the agency disclosed no members of the Communist Party.

#### CHARGE

LeRoi Jones "hate-the-whites" Black Arts Theatre got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-Act before police discovered an arsenal on the premises.

#### ANSWER

The Black Arts Theatre was funded without the knowledge or approval of OEO as part of Project Uplift in the summer of 1965. When it became evident that the theatre was not fulfilling a legitimate purpose, funds were cut off and it was shut down. Later, a private group took over the premises. Following a shooting incident, police did find a number of guns in the building, but there was no connection between this and the defunct anti-poverty project.

#### CHARGE

OEO fights riots with grants.

#### ANSWER

Absolutely untrue. Our purpose is to help people help themselves out of poverty. In a message of July 20 to all Community Action Program personnel, Mr. Shriver said: "Lest there be any misunderstanding about what OEO policy has been and continues to be, let me make it unmistakably clear once again. There will be absolute insistence that every OEO employee and every employee of an OEO grantee scrupulously avoid and resist participation by OEO-funded resources in any activities which threaten public order in any community. I shall insist upon immediate and full penalties for any individuals found guilty of wrong behavior in this connection. Furthermore, I shall insist upon the withholding of OEO funds from any grantee or delegate agency which is shown to be encouraging or tolerating such behavior."

#### CHARGE

"Several" arrests in Newark and five arrests in New York.

#### ANSWER

Only one of nearly 2,000 anti-poverty workers was arrested in Newark. He has not yet come to trial. There were three (not five) Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, out of more than 30,000, arrested in New York. These enrollees are recipients, rather than workers, in the anti-poverty program. Since these recipients, as residents of slum areas, are among the group most exposed to the possibility of racial disturbances, the relatively small number arrested (.0017 of the enrollees in the cities surveyed) is a strong indication of the effectiveness of OEO programs in helping avoid disturbances. In most cases, including Newark and Detroit, NYC enrollees were highly praised by police chiefs for their role in helping control the riots.

### CRISIS IN LIBERALISM

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, New Leader magazine for October 23 contains a think piece which I am sure not all Members of this body, or of my party, will agree with. It is controversial. It does raise possibilities that some may say



could never occur. But it also should cause us to think. I refer to an article entitled "The Liberal Crisis," written by Gus Tyler. It is a commentary on the dangers of the so-called dump-Johnson movement within the ranks of liberal Democrats. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**DANGERS OF THE DUMP-JOHNSON MOVEMENT:  
THE LIBERAL CRISIS**

(By Gus Tyler)

As the nation moves toward the 1968 elections, American liberalism faces the most serious crisis of this century. The peril to the liberals arises from dark and destructive forces at work in the country, and from deep divisions within the progressive-minded community. Unless liberalism can close political ranks to check the onrush of reaction, America can be swept into a dismal abyss of prolonged reaction.

The drama of the 1968 elections will be played against a double backdrop: violence and Vietnam. Both will profoundly affect the outcome in the voting no matter what the Johnson Administration does either in urban America or in Southeast Asia.

The racial riots of 1967, like other riotous moments in America, are part of a continuing and developing movement with its own momentum and inner dynamic. What started many years ago as spontaneous and sporadic outbursts has, in recent years, taken on form and direction. Riot and threat of riot are used as conscious instruments to win demands—specific and vague. Out of the cauldron is emerging a political coalition of black revolutionaries, Muslims and the Negro underworld which seeks to use violence as a tool of purpose. The most irreconcilable elements in this loose combine are the extremists who do not believe that America is a viable civilization, who feel the only hope lies in a nihilistic and uninhibited destruction of the society.

The riots of 1967 are a prelude and rehearsal to those of 1968. While a massive program for the ghettos would undoubtedly do much to dampen the explosive materials of riot, even the most generous effort is unlikely to have meaningful impact by 1968. And it is far less likely that the present Congress will enact any program—massive or midget. The fuel for the fire will be on hand next summer. The leadership for the systematic use of violence will, by 1968, have established its authority—in no small part as a result of operations run in 1967. If one is to trust knowledgeable rumor, the next move will be to carry the flames outside the ghetto to adjacent neighborhoods.

But whether or not riots, inside or outside the ghetto, are on the drawing boards of the "revolutionaries," there are enough combustibles around for the most accidental spark in 1968 to set off the explosion. The response to such an explosion can be predicted from several centuries of American experience with social conflict. Riot makes counter-riot; violence makes vigilantism. In 1968, the ever dormant spirit of vigilantism is likely to arise brutally—both on the streets and at the polls.

If the spirit of violence should flag either in the ghetto or in the surrounding white community, there are racist and reactionary forces to whip up the fury. Legislators can do it by callous disregard; Right extremists can do it by financing the sparks to set the fire; parochial politicians will do it as a cheap and easy way to fame and fortune.

In 1968, there will be a vigilante vote—as well as vigilante violence. It may prove the pivotal power for putting a like-minded man in the White House.

Peace in Vietnam is not apt to reverse or

check racial conflict. Indeed, quite the opposite is probable. If peace was made in Southeast Asia before the first of the year, the most immediate impact on the American economy would be a dip in employment. Demobilization of Negro soldiers, fewer job openings, a higher rate of Negro joblessness—especially among the young—could only add fuel to the flame. While it is entirely possible and desirable for America to work out "peace-time" plans to take up the slack, such plans would get little backing in the present Congress—and in no event could they have an effect in time to provide needed employment before the fall of 1968.

For the militant Negro ideologue or demagogue, American withdrawal from Vietnam would provide conclusive proof that this civilization is on the way out, about to be pushed into oblivion. This conviction would be incendiary propaganda in the mouths of the militants.

Thus whatever the merits may be for hastening a settlement in Asia, it is a vast misjudgment to assume that the fate of the ghettos will be settled in Vietnam. The notion that peace over there means peace over here is a self-delusion induced by incantations in a dove-cote.

Regardless of Johnson's actions in Vietnam between now and Election Day, moreover, the issue will be with the country on that fateful Tuesday. If he makes a settlement it will, of necessity, be frayed with loose ends: boundaries, role of the Vietcong, presence of guarantors, etc. The Republicans will grab each loose thread to unravel the Administration, wrapping their yarn around the accusative query: "Is this what our boys died for?" If Johnson continues on present course, he will be hit from both sides: either "get out" or "go all out" or both.

Johnson would overcome both these obstacles—violence and Vietnam—with a united liberal front. But this unity is lacking . . . at the moment. Within the progressive community in 1967 there is a group whose basic strategy is negative: "beat Johnson." Its logic runs in three steps:

1. Any Republican, including Richard Nixon or Ronald Reagan, is more likely to settle Vietnam than Johnson, in the same way that Eisenhower settled Korea after Truman.

2. Even if this does not happen, in 1972 the Democrats could oust the Republicans.

3. At that time, the Democratic party will be in the hands of its liberal wing.

For a brief moment, this faction in the liberal community toyed with a third-party movement: the Spock-King ticket. The Negro nihilists knocked that notion out of their heads at last month's National Conference for New Politics in Chicago. So the "beat Johnson" faction now turns to the Democratic party (a) to name convention delegates to nominate someone or anyone other than LBJ; (b) to undermine Johnson in the election of 1968; (c) and then in 1972 to use this movement to name a true liberal to take the White House.

The strategy is simple and suicidal.

The first victims of this "beat Johnson" movement will be the Representatives and Senators in the "peace wing" of Congress. A battle over convention delegates will deeply divide the Democratic party ranks. Congressmen and Senators will not escape the conflict unscathed. In the case of a George McGovern (D-S.D.), or others like him, who are already in deep trouble because of their "dove" posture, a further division within their party is a guarantee of defeat. Put otherwise, in a divided and splintered liberal coalition, the first to suffer will be the men who are liberals on domestic issues and who are foreign policy doves. But they will not be alone. The resolve of the peace-at-all-cost people to defeat the Johnson crowd will also hit the liberals who back the Administration on Vietnam. In short, the "beat John-

son" movement inevitably, if not intentionally, becomes a beat-the-liberals-for-Congress movement: both liberal doves and liberal hawks.

A conservative Congress—much more conservative than the present—will not only affect legislation but may very well turn topsy turvy all calculations on the presidency in 1968. In this regard, 1968 could be unlike any other election in American history.

A George Wallace candidacy would have a peculiar effect on the electoral, as distinguished from the popular vote. In terms of popular vote, Wallace would help LBJ win a plurality. Johnson's liberalism—especially on civil rights—has lost him many voters who in 1968 would go Republican. If Wallace runs, however, many of the same voters would vote Dixiecrat instead of GOP, thereby cutting into Republican strength.

But in terms of the electoral vote, the Wallace candidacy could have an altogether different impact on 1968—and on the future of American politics. If he carries as much of the South as predicted, he will garner some 100 electoral votes. In that event, it would be necessary for either the Democratic or Republican candidate for President to win at least 270 electoral votes out of the remaining 438—to be elected. Had this happened in 1948, or 1960, neither Truman nor Kennedy would have had enough electoral votes to win.

If neither Democrat nor Republican get a majority of the votes in 1968, then the contest goes to the House of Representatives—at which point the political complexion of the House becomes decisive because it is the body that will now pick the President out of the top three runners.

In the House, the balance of power would be in the hands of the South. Indeed, its power is heavily exaggerated since each state including the thinly populated states of the South, casts only one vote: Louisiana equals Illinois; Mississippi equals New York; and Alabama equals California.

Southern strategy in this situation must be envisioned against the background of riots in the summer of 1968. The first impact of such disturbances would be to swell the Wallace vote—both North and South. The second impact would be on the Southern Congressional delegations that would normally vote for the Democratic candidate for President if the contest went to the House. In 1968, they might do otherwise.

The South may now lead America down the path to reaction—by playing an independent role. Discussing 1968 at a political action meeting of the AFL-CIO, Bayard Rustin recently said: "The nation moves toward 1968, a year of historic importance, in a mood of confusion, unrest, uncertainty. Exploiting Vietnam and the Negro's agony, the Right wing prepares to launch a comeback. If successful, it will profoundly alter the direction of American politics and most grievously set back the Negro." In setting this altered direction, the South would be in the driver's seat.

Given the choice between a Johnson and a Reagan, the Southern delegations could decide to go for Reagan or—if wooed by LBJ—to succumb at a devilish price: my body for your soul. Given the alternate choice between a Johnson and a Rockefeller, the South could say, "a plague on both your houses," and cast its vote for Wallace to elect no President. (This is constitutionally possible, since the top three names for President go before the House and a majority is needed for election.)

The latter course, a stalemate in the House, is unlikely because as matters stand right now the GOP candidate will not be Rockefeller but someone more congenial to the Southern spirit. But if Rockefeller (or someone like him) is the candidate and the South should decide to stalemate the election, the political potential becomes bizarre: The Sen-

ate chooses the Vice President on a one-man-one-vote basis, and if the House cannot agree on a President, then the Veep becomes Prexy.

This improbable, but possible, freak could put a Reagan directly in the White House, although he runs for Vice President rather than President. At present, the strongest ticket the Republicans can field against Johnson is Rockefeller-Reagan. Should it turn out that the Senate—and not the House—chooses the President, Reagan becomes a real possibility for the Presidency, riding into the White House on Rocky's coat-tails.

The Southern Democrats in House and Senate would normally not bolt their Presidential candidates. But 1968 will not be normal. The election is apt to be run against a background of flaming cities, with a reactionary South discovering new allies in the North and a last best hope to run America. The year 1968 may be as abnormal as 1860, when a new party on a newly realigned base came to power. In terms of issues, 1968 could be 1860 played backwards.

Ordinarily, if Southern Democrats bolted their party they would be jeopardizing the prized seniority and chairmanships that the Dixie solons enjoy. But in a "realignment" the South could easily make a deal with GOP leadership—and the President-to-be—to "organize" both houses in an overt conservative coalition thus preserving Southern superiority in the Senate and House committees. (In the New York State Legislature just a couple of years ago, it was the Republicans—together with "Wagner" Democrats—who gave Anthony Travia and Joseph Zaretzki the necessary votes to head the Legislature. There is no constitutional provision to prevent the same from happening in the U.S. Congress.)

Such an eventuality would be a bit of historic irony for liberals who have long urged party realignment. So far, the liberals have failed to convert the New Deal coalition into a "party." In Congress, the conservatives have long had such an informal "party" on Capitol Hill, voting in consistent concert. In 1968, this Congressional coalition of conservatism may have its first chance to elect its President by its own acts—with the South holding the power and mapping the strategy.

In discussions about the forthcoming elections, 1968 has been analogized with other recent contests, particularly 1948 and 1952, with pro-Johnson people pointing to the former and liberal anti-Johnson people the latter. In fact, both analogies are right—and wrong.

In 1948, Harry Truman—like Lyndon Johnson today—appeared to be in trouble. His "left" wing was being torn away by Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party; his "right" wing by Strom Thurmond and the Dixiecrats. The "left" Democrats were hitting Truman because of his cold war policy, the "right" Democrats were hitting him for his pro-civil rights policy. Americans for Democratic Action started a "dump-Truman" movement and turned to Dwight Eisenhower as an alternative, just as some individual liberals (though not ADA this time) are now involved in a "dump-Johnson" movement that seeks another General as a possible candidate, James Gavin. In the election itself, Truman came galloping up to win—with liberal backing, as may happen with LBJ.

Thus far the analogy holds, but not much farther. The support for George Wallace is much greater than that for Thurmond. If Truman had lost the whole South, he would have lost the Presidency. A Reagan is not an Eisenhower—especially if a Republican President is elected in the House with Southern aid. But above all else, the mood of the country is different: Black "revolution" is stirring white "counter-revolution," an atavistic return to a dark dead past.

The "dump-Johnson" people, such as

James Wechsler, prefer to parallel 1968 with 1952. That was the year Truman decided not to run, allegedly because he was scared off by the New Hampshire primary. Anti-Johnson liberals hope to scare LBJ off from running in 1968.

If this is carried one step further, though, it becomes most unappetizing. Upon Truman's withdrawal, the Democrats named Adlai Stevenson, the liberal's dream boat, for the Presidency. He ran a bright, brittle campaign in which he restored the English language to its proper place in Western civilization. But it was not he—it was Ike and Dick—who ended up in the White House. And four years later there was more of the same, only more so.

Should the history of 1952 repeat itself, liberals would have a chance to relive the agony of the Ike age in a time of trouble and turmoil. Ike put the New Deal on ice; a Republicrat President in 1968 and beyond would put the nation on fire.

The liberal community has not, until recently, been even dimly aware of the dangerous potential. The great preoccupation has been with Vietnam—both pro and con—almost exclusively. The far greater danger arising from the political crisis within the country has gone almost unnoticed.

Until recently, some of the loudest voices in liberal circles spoke out for a third party. The big moment was to be the meeting of the National Conference for New Politics in Chicago over the Labor Day weekend. Whatever evils issued from that confab, it was an ill wind that blew some good. It killed a national third-party, for this year. The formal burial took place at the ADA national board meeting in September, when the organization formally went on record as opposed to a third party. Nobody spoke for the corpse, including those who—in the recent past—were for it.

With the collapse of third-partyism, some of its sponsors together with other anti-Johnson elements began to beef up a "dump-Johnson" campaign. The plan is to run anti-Johnson delegates to the Democratic national convention.

At the September meeting of ADA—the commonly alleged establishment of the liberal community—the question of a "dump-Johnson" movement was at the core of the agenda. Although the press reported this as a gathering to formulate policy on Vietnam, the ADA board was actually without any authority to act on that subject because the Spring convention of the organization had already mapped policy. The board meeting dealt with political—rather than foreign—policy, concentrating on matters such as third-party, "dump-Johnson," convention and endorsement strategy.

The heaviest blow against the "dump-Johnson" movement was struck by Joe Rauh—Mr. ADA—in a memorandum he had circulated on July 28, 1967. He opposed the movement on practical grounds; it would fail, and it would discredit the movement for peace: "Just as the Kennedy-Fulbright draft will fail to produce delegates because Kennedy will repudiate it in most dramatic form, so any other similar effort in behalf of anti-Johnson delegates will fail because no responsible people inside the Democratic party will allow their names to be connected with a drive against a Democratic President, and especially so hopeless a drive. Here, too, the net result is bound to be few, if any, delegates and a minimization of the peace strength in America to a fraction of its true proportions."

The positive alternative proposal in the Rauh document was a drive to write a peace plank into the Democratic party platform. There were several attempts to reverse the Rauh approach at the ADA board, probably the best attended in its history. The first proposal—to have ADA back the "dump-Johnson" movement—was defeated 73 to 12.

Two other moves were defeated: one to allow chapters and individuals to join the dumpers in the name of ADA; the second to instruct ADA to seek an alternative candidate to LBJ.

The board decision, however, has not inhibited a handful of individuals in ADA (though without ADA authority) from going ahead with their "dump-Johnson" effort. From their view, they cannot lose: If LBJ is beaten at the convention, they will have won; if LBJ is defeated in 1968, they will also have won. They talk about 1968 but they mean 1972. They are thinking like Louis XV standing on his head: *Après le déluge, moi.*

If one must look for historical analogies for 1968, it is less in the America of the 1940s and 1950s than in the Germany of the 1930s. Then the great danger was Hitler. But to a sector of the Left—the Communists—the real enemy was social democracy. The coalition that might have halted Hitler was torn with fratricide. The Communists termed the Social Democrats "social-fascists"; they turned the "main fire" against those closest to them; they welcomed Hitler to power with the proclamation: *Nach Hitler, Kommen Wir.*

No doubt this analogy—like most historical parallels—is faulty. But in terms of long-range historic impact, what happened in Germany in the '30s may be closer to the danger we face in 1968 than what happened in America in either 1948 or 1952.

## OPEN HOUSING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of Sunday, October 8, Mr. Fred P. Graham wrote an article concerning the Jones against Mayer Co. lawsuit pending before the U.S. Supreme Court.

The article concludes by stating that should the Court rule for the complainants, the effect would be to eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation.

This, in my judgment, does not follow. Legislation will still be necessary even should the Court declare for the complainants in the Jones against Mayer case. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from David A. Brody, of the Antidefamation League, dealing with this subject. His letter makes very clear that legislation will be necessary, and it explains why.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE COURTS MAY SETTLE OPEN HOUSING

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON.—Events are quietly under way here that could lead to the creation of an effectual Federal fair housing law—not by an act of Congress, but by a decision of the Supreme Court.

As the Court opened its 1967 term last week with the usual round of secret conferences on pending petitions for review, two factors made this result possible.

One was the presence among the petitions of an appeal which contends that the United States already has a law against racial discrimination in housing—an 1866 statute that has been enforced once in this century as a fair housing law but has since been almost forgotten.

The other was a series of discussions that were held in the Justice Department, where some top officials are arguing that the Government should enter the case as a friend of the court and urge the Supreme Court to re-suscitate the old law so that the lower courts can use it to bar discrimination in housing. These events date back to the summer of



1965, when Joseph Lee Jones and his wife Barbara Jo picked out a pleasant lot in Pad-dock Woods, a new subdivision in suburban St. Louis, and offered to pay the advertised \$28,195 price to have a house built on it. But Mr. Jones is a Negro and his wife is white, and their offer was rejected.

#### A LONG SHOT

Congress at that time had not even begun to consider the ill-fated fair housing law that succumbed to a Senate filibuster in 1966. So the Joneses' lawyer tried a long shot. He sued the developers on the theory that existing statutes and constitutional amendments, read in the light of the latest Supreme Court decisions, already add up to an enforceable fair housing law.

At the heart of the argument is the civil rights act of 1866, passed to implement the 13th Amendment, which outlawed slavery. The law said: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every state and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property."

This law has been recodified and blended with subsequent legislation down through the years, but it still exists on the statute books, currently in Section 1982 of the United States Code.

In 1903 a Federal judge in Arkansas did enforce it to block a landowner from refusing to lease land to a Negro, but otherwise most lawyers have assumed that a succession of Supreme Court interpretations of the reconstructions laws and amendments have made it unenforceable.

These decisions held that the 13th Amendment, which can be enforced against individuals, could be used only to stop people from treating Negroes as slaves. Efforts to eliminate racial discrimination against the freed slaves were held to be enforceable only under the authority of the 14th Amendment.

Since the 14th Amendment forbids only discrimination by state action and does not touch bias by private persons, lawyers assumed that the 1866 law could not be enforced against individuals to block racial discrimination in housing.

On these grounds the Joneses lost in Federal District Court and in the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

#### PLAUSIBLE REASONS

But now the case is up on appeal to the Supreme Court, where the Joneses (and a coalition of civil rights groups that have taken up their cause) have offered the Justices a number of plausible legal reasons for upholding their right to sue.

They claim that Negroes' inability to purchase homes on equal terms with whites is a remaining "vestige of slavery" that can still be attacked under the 13th Amendment.

Further, they contend that the state was involved in the developers' discrimination in violation of the 14th Amendment, because it had the legal power to stop it but permitted it to happen.

Finally, they cite statements in opinions signed by six of the Justices in a 1966 civil rights decision to the effect that "state action" is no longer necessary in certain 14th Amendment cases.

Lawyers can differ on the relative soundness of these arguments, but most would agree that they are substantial enough to support a decision for the plaintiffs if a majority of the Supreme Court is disposed to do so. On far shakier grounds than these the Court last spring upheld California's fair housing law, despite an overwhelming vote by the people in favor of abolishing it.

Since then, the Court has acquired its first Negro Justice, Thurgood Marshall. His presence should strengthen sentiment on the Court in favor of taking the plunge on housing discrimination, as the Court did on the school segregation issue in 1954.

Congress is frozen on fair housing, as it was on school desegregation, yet political reaction against a bold housing decision might not be too severe; a majority of both Houses of Congress voted on the side of fair housing before the filibuster killed it in 1966.

If the Court should hand down the sweeping decision the Jones appeal asks, the effect would be to eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation; Federal courts could bar racial discrimination in housing—in any form, including private sales between individuals—anywhere it occurred in the country.

#### ANTIDISCRIMINATION LEAGUE,

Washington, D.C., October 11, 1967.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Fred P. Graham points out in his timely and informative column in the New York Times of Sunday, October 8, if the Supreme Court should agree to hear the case of *Jones v. Mayer Co.* and later uphold the contention of the petitioners that the 1866 Civil Rights Act bars housing discrimination by private individuals even where there is no state involvement, that decision would mean that the nation already has a national fair housing law. But, it would not, as Mr. Graham goes on to state, eliminate the need for new fair housing legislation.

If the 1866 law should be held to bar housing discrimination by private persons, enforcement of the right to equality of housing opportunity would be left to individual suits brought by the aggrieved individual. While the private law suit has accounted for many of the Court's landmark decisions in the area of racial discrimination, most notably the 1954 school desegregation cases (indeed *Jones v. Mayer Co.* itself may prove to be such a landmark case), it is a retail, costly, time-consuming and not too effectual approach for dealing with the still pervasive and persistent problem of discrimination.

Experience has demonstrated that if civil rights statutes are to be meaningful and more than mere wholesome declarations of policy, the responsibility for carrying out the mandate of the law must be shifted from the individual complainant to the specialized administrative agency which must have the power to initiate proceedings on its own motion without first waiting for individual complaints, as well as the power to issue judicially enforceable cease and desist orders after a full administrative hearing. Consequently, as welcome as a decision by the Court would be that the nation already has a federal fair housing law, additional legislation would still be needed. Vindication of the statutory right must not be left solely to the victim of the discrimination. What would still be required is effective administrative enforcement machinery and authority for the Attorney General to institute suits against recalcitrant builders and realtors who may continue to practice discrimination in violation of the law as provided for in S. 1358, the Fair Housing Act of 1967 introduced by you and a bipartisan group of 21 Senators. Only in this way can the right of equal housing opportunity be effectively secured.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. BRODY.

#### INDIA'S VIEW OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a dispatch from New Delhi, published in the Washington Post of Saturday, October 21. It gives an informed analysis of India's view of the war in Vietnam. The dispatch, by Bernard D. Nossiter, goes to the heart of the dilemma posed for India by its desire for

peace but its lingering suspicion of western powers in Asian affairs.

India's concerns are, as Mr. Nossiter points out, primarily her own concerns. She wants to feel secure, and for that reason wants American forces in Asia, if not in India.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### VIETNAM WAR POSES A DILEMMA FOR INDIA

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

NEW DELHI, October 19.—Of all the puzzles in India's foreign policy, there are few as perplexing as this government's ambiguous stand on Vietnam.

The confusion arises because New Delhi is pulled in two directions. It has a direct interest in peace in Southeast Asia and harbors some lingering suspicion of the role played there by a Western power such as the United States. At the same time, India looks on China as its primary enemy and is not unhappy that the world's most powerful military force is present in the region to check Peking.

Today was the fifth anniversary of India's clash with China and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi reminded her countrymen:

"Whatever else has changed in the last five years, China's aggressive posture has not stopped. Indeed, China has continued to show open hostility to India . . . Let us be on guard against this continuing menace."

#### CROSSED SIGNALS

The twin pulls, the wish for peace and fear of China, lay behind the crossed diplomatic signals India sent out earlier this month. The Defense Minister and likeliest candidate for the Foreign Ministry post that Mrs. Gandhi now fills, Sardar Swaran Singh, told the U.N. General Assembly that he was "confident" that Hanoi would "respond favorably" to a halt in American bombing. The next day, Mrs. Gandhi observed tartly that this was just one man's opinion.

India is in constant touch with North Vietnam. Both nations maintain consuls general in each other's capitals. Indian diplomats have been pressing Hanoi to give some pledge that they will make a reciprocal response if the United States halts its bombing. New Delhi has not tried to specify what the response should be, because the talks have never gone that far.

India has gotten no assurances in reply. Instead, the North Vietnamese have repeated that they will make an appropriate response to a bombing halt.

Whether this means that Hanoi would stop sending troops south, sit down to peace talks or something else, the Indians do not know.

#### WORTH THE RISK

Nevertheless, New Delhi believes that there is little to lose and probably much to gain by stopping the bombing. Officials here cite American statements that bombing has not materially affected Hanoi's infiltration of the South. They believe that a cessation would lead Hanoi to peace talks, that North Vietnam would then stand up to strong Chinese pressure for continued fighting. The Indians acknowledge that this is an opinion, and that bombing halt could disadvantage the United States. The argument here is that this is a risk worth taking.

If peace was restored, New Delhi believes two important consequences would follow. North Vietnam would be free of Chinese pressure and, with aid from the Soviet Union and its own anti-Chinese tradition, would drift away from its close ties to Peking.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union would be free to invest more heavily in the development of Southeast Asia. The

Indians believe that the Chinese are a threat primarily to unstable regimes and that a big investment program would make the region less vulnerable.

There is an even more direct Indian interest in peace in Vietnam. New Delhi sees itself protected from China by two powerful forces, the United States and the Soviet Union. Continued division between Peking and Moscow is an essential condition for support from the Soviet Union, support that now takes the form of both arms and economic aid. Indians fear that if the Vietnamese war is prolonged, the great split in the Communist world could be healed and China would have a more open road into the subcontinent.

India's stake in Vietnamese peace does not mean that New Delhi wants American forces to withdraw from Southeast Asia. Indians simultaneously believe that stable regimes can withstand the Chinese and that it is a good thing to have American troops nearby.

#### TROOPS TO STAY

New Delhi hopes that American forces will remain in Laos and Thailand. India would like to see Cambodia and Burma someday welcome American airmen and soldiers. Even in a peaceful Vietnam, Indians say there is no conflict between their interests and a continued American military presence. In other words, India likes the idea of having U.S. troops on all sides, but not in India itself.

New Delhi's fear of China is leading to a renewed effort for a settlement with Pakistan. India would like to convince its neighbor that China is their big mutual worry.

India and Pakistan are about to restore telephone and telegraph links broken after their 1965 war. Negotiators will next work at reviving air travel between the two.

Sometime next year, India plans to propose talks that would reopen trade, which has also been cut off since the war.

However, it is questionable whether Pakistan will go along with this. From Pakistan's standpoint, the burning issue is not China, but India's possession of Kashmir. And despite India's fear of China and talk of a settlement with Pakistan, New Delhi regards Kashmir's adherence to the Indian Union as an irrevocable fact.

#### GOVERNMENT ACTION KNOCKS DOWN PRICE OF HIDES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article entitled "Cattle-Hide Prices Reach 2-Year Low as U.S. Demand Shrinks and Exports Drop," published in the Wall Street Journal.

The opening sentence of this article reads:

A shortage of cattle hides that prompted the Government to curb exports 19 months ago is turning into a glut; prices have fallen since late summer and currently are at a two-year low.

Low hide prices mean, of course, either lower prices for live animals, or higher prices for meat, or both.

About a year and a half ago, in response to pressure from the buyers of cattle hides in this country, the Federal Government hastily imposed quotas on the exports of hides, on the theory that the country faced an impending shortage.

That action was most ill advised. No shortage was impending. Within a few months it became apparent that the country had a surplus, not a shortage of hides. The principal effect of that action was to frighten our foreign customers into looking for alternative sources of hides. In other words, it was destructive of

our long-range position in foreign markets, and harmful to the price of hides, and to the price of cattle. It was a class action; it favored one economic group—the makers of leather and of shoes and other leather products, at the expense of another group, the livestock industry.

In response to heated protests from Members of Congress and others, that restriction on exports was lifted a few months later, but not until much damage—permanent damage—has been done.

Mr. President, last week the Congress of the United States was treated to some stern lectures on the importance of the export trade by four members of the President's Cabinet, who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to denounce various proposals to regulate the flow of imports of several key commodities into this country. The committee was told in no uncertain terms that it must not meddle with our foreign trade policy, and that the President's official family was best qualified to handle such matters, and also that they were engaged in protecting and promoting our export trade at every opportunity. One of those who appeared was the Secretary of Commerce, Alexander Trowbridge.

It is regrettable that the Department of Commerce was not as sedulous in promoting our export volume of hides early last year. It was the Department of Commerce which imposed the restrictions on hide exports in March of 1966. Presumably the Department of Agriculture concurred, or at least made no objection. Now, it is obvious that a tragic mistake was made from which the livestock industry of this country will suffer, but which it is now too late to repair.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITIES: CATTLE-HIDE PRICES REACH 2-YEAR LOW AS U.S. DEMAND SHRINKS AND EXPORTS DROP

(By Laird B. Anderson)

CHICAGO.—A shortage of cattle hides that prompted the Government to curb exports 19 months ago is turning into a glut; prices have fallen since late summer and currently are at a two-year low.

The price decline means lower raw-material costs for shoes, gloves and a host of other leather products. But it also means higher costs for beef processors who count on hide sales to offset part of what they pay for live steers.

"I can't see where the market is going to show any improvement," says one hide broker gloomily as he surveys the outlook for the troubled commodity.

Hide prices have been swinging sharply in recent years, in large part because of a head-on clash between new patterns of leather consumption and Government efforts to ensure enough hides for domestic needs.

The upside part of that price swing started almost two years ago. At the time, greater affluence overseas was spurring foreign demand for leather shoes. But, at the same time, Argentina, a major world supplier of hides, was being forced by drought and other factors to reduce its offerings to the world market to 6.8 million in 1965 from 12.1 million hides in 1962.

On the Chicago market, the quote for light native cow hides, a high-quality grade used to make the upper part of shoes, nearly

doubled in little more than a year, to a six-year high of 26 cents a pound in February 1966 from 13.5 cents a pound in January 1965.

#### GOVERNMENT STEPS IN

Then the Government stepped in. Commerce Department planners, concerned that U.S. hide merchants were exporting too many hides needed for the U.S. and other leather industries, decreed in March 1966 that exports had to be cut 16% from the 1965 level. Such exports in 1965 had climbed to 13.3 million hides from 11.5 million the year before. The Commerce Department was predicting then that exports would continue to rise to over 14 million in 1966. By the agency's reckoning, this would leave U.S. users in 1966 with 21.1 million hides, or 2.7 million less than they needed.

As might be expected, domestic prices fell on the quota plan. By May 1966, when the Government had eased somewhat its export restrictions, the Chicago price for hides had declined from the previous February's 26-cent level to 23 cents a pound, and the price continued to slump to a 1966 low of 15.5 cents a pound in October.

By then, however, Commerce Department strategists had decided it was time to withdraw the export restrictions. Again, the Chicago hide market reflected the change. Prices turned up sharply from October's 15.5-cent low to 19.5 cents at the end of 1966, and continued to rise through February of this year to 21.5 cents a pound.

By about that time, however, according to industry officials, a backlash against the Government's export quotas was beginning to hit the domestic industry. The quotas actually had failed to hold exports below the level that Commerce Department statisticians had predicted before the controls were imposed. Even with the restrictions, U.S. hide exports climbed to 14.1 million hides last year from 13.3 million in 1965.

#### COURTING DISENCHANTED CUSTOMERS

But John K. Minnoch, president of the National Hide Association here, says the quotas were eminently successful in convincing foreign buyers that they had better look outside the U.S. for their hide supplies. Argentina, where production was just starting to recover, began aggressively courting disenchanted customers and started lifting sales sharply by the close of last year. Argentina's sales climbed to 8.1 million hides in 1966 from 1965's depressed level of 6.8 million.

That switch away from the U.S. is intensifying this year. U.S. exports, unencumbered by any Commerce Department restrictions, declined 11% in the first eight months of this year, to 8 million hides from more than 9 million a year before. Argentina's exports, by contrast, rose 4.5% to more than 5.6 million from 5.4 million in January-August 1966.

Synthetic materials also are being used increasingly by foreign shoemakers as substitutes for the leather they had been buying in the U.S.

And, to the woe of both U.S. hide merchants and U.S. leather product manufacturers, more of these foreign-made products (with their foreign-origin leather) are being imported into the U.S., thereby reducing the demand for domestic hides.

#### HIGHER IMPORT BARRIERS URGED

In the first eight months of this year, shoe imports into the U.S. soared almost 30% from the 1966 level, to 88.6 million pairs valued at \$141.4 million. According to the Tanners' Council of America, leather handbag imports jumped 38%, glove imports climbed 40% and imports of such smaller products as wallets were up 38%.

Understandably, U.S. production declined as imports swelled. Output of leather shoes and boots by domestic makers dropped 9.1% in the first seven months of the year from the 1966 pace, to 341.3 million pairs. The



decline, says Irving R. Glass, executive vice president of the Tanners' Council, is as "serious as anything I've seen."

Some shoe manufacturers are predicting that domestic output may bounce back by the end of the year. Others, however, aren't so sure, and both tanners and shoemakers are pressing Congress to erect higher import barriers against foreign-made leather goods.

What's more, to the further chagrin of the U.S. hide industry, synthetic materials are being used increasingly in the number of shoes being produced in the U.S. Du Pont Co. said shoemakers last year bought enough Corfam, its leather substitute, to make 12 million pairs of shoes. That would account for only 2% of U.S. shoe production, but it was almost 2½ times the amount of Corfam sold in 1965. Still further gains are being posted this year, Du Pont says. Industry sources say that a Japanese substitute, Clairino, also is boosting sales.

For Mr. Minnoch of the Hide Association, the double onslaught of declining export and shrinking domestic demand has prompted dire forecasts that the industry may end up the year stuck with 500,000 to one million spoilable hides.

On the Chicago hide market, the declines have triggered a predictable price slide. The key grade of light native cow hides currently is quoted at 14.5 cents a pound, up slightly from the 13.5-cent quote in effect during late August and early September, but still off substantially from the 24.5-cent level of eight months ago.

For shoe manufacturers, who figure that hides account for 20% to 25% of the cost of making a better grade of men's shoe and 30% of the manufacturing cost of a woman's shoe, the lower hide price means lower outlays for materials. But some big shoe manufacturers, even so, recently posted price increases of 3% to 4%, saying spiraling wage costs and technical improvements have more than offset the lower hide prices.

In the packing industry, by contrast, lower hide prices mean higher net costs. At current prices, packing houses can sell the hide from an average 1,200-pound steer for only about \$10, down from nearly \$14 this past February. That \$4 difference is reflected in higher meat prices.

#### HO CHI MINH, "MAN OF THE YEAR"

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, columnist Howard K. Smith, in the Sunday Star, counters the propaganda widespread even in this country, which pictures Ho Chi Minh as a "wise little Uncle Ho."

It is not so, says Smith, piling up the record of a despot, including the numbers of dead left behind as Ho consolidated his power in North Vietnam, then moved to extend it to the south. It is a fraud. But it is a fraud being fed these days by a handful of writers permitted to take conducted tours of North Vietnam. They come back and joke about Ho's claims that there are no North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam. It is a bald faced lie, but they joke. Then they turn the President of the United States on a stake labeled "credibility gap" because he withholds a bit of information for state reasons.

Perhaps Ho Chi Minh is indeed wise. But he is certainly playing some people for fools.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's column nominating Ho Chi Minh as "Man of the Year" for his achievements in fiction be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HO AS THE "MAN OF THE YEAR"

About this time each year the well known news magazine begins to sort out possible choices for its Man of the Year. I doubt if I will get around to mailing it but my nomination is Ho Chi Minh. The formidable wisp is one of the bloodiest despots of a bloody century, as immoral as he is incompetent at government—yet, in the guise of wise little Uncle Ho, he is winning the Vietnam propaganda war.

Ho's transcendent talent has been in organized destruction. But after Dien Bien Phu in 1954 he had to run a nation instead of merely destroy it, and the results were almost all disastrous.

First of all nearly 900,000 of his people abandoned homes and jobs and farms and fled to South Vietnam. If the Economist of London is right, 250,000 more were ready to flee when the borders were shut.

Then to break opposition he presided over a bloodbath of vast proportions for a small country. The late Dr. Bernard Fall estimated close to 50,000 were murdered. That, however, could be a minimum based on a few cases in which trustworthy eyewitnesses were present. One such case occurred when peasants stormed a Jeep containing the Canadian member of the International Control Commission and begged to be allowed to go to South Vietnam. He sent a division of troops to that region and 6,000 were "deported" or executed.

After two years, Ho's General Giap said in a famous speech, "We made too many deviations and executed too many honest people. We attacked on too large a front and, seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror which became too widespread . . . torture came to be regarded as normal practice."

After that Ho stopped executing "too many" honest people and resorting to terror that was "too widespread," and merely applied enough. He won his 1960 election with a 99.91% vote, somewhat aided by the fact that he had no opponent.

Ho not only had the reputation of being a great national popular hero who fearlessly faced public opinion, but also of being a great social reformer, friend to the peasant. That was due to his great land reform in which land was taken from the rich and given the poor—though Russian statistics show the rich were comparatively richer afterwards. Anyhow, there was enough abandoned refugee land left so that yields of rice per hectare rose a little until 1960; since then low morale and bad management have sent them ever downward.

A British expert argues that the reason Ho decided to go south and resume the more familiar arts of destruction was that construction was not doing well in the north. In the south, his minions assassinated 30,000 South Vietnamese civilians in a decade, not counting those killed in combat action.

Ho's military success is not mysterious. Destruction is simply vastly easier than construction. It takes six years of college education and about a year more of work to build a bridge. It takes a half-hour of explanation and ten minutes of work to set the fuses to blow it up.

Ho's triumph is in creating and maintaining an image of being conciliatory—or even peace-loving, a nationalist George Washington, and a constructive social reformer. All that is pure fraud.

He succeeds due to the perverseness of human nature. One and all may go freely to South Vietnam, see what they wish and write without censorship. A useful few are admitted to North Vietnam on strictly supervised tours. From the free writers in south Vietnam come venomous and unfair articles like Mary McCarthy's admittedly loaded ob-

servations. From the restricted few in the north comes a dutiful parroting of Ho's line.

Thus Harry Ashmore, back from Ho's presence, added his weight to the view that the U.S. frustrates Ho's conciliatory peacefulness. Yet the U.S. is on record almost weekly for peace talks while Ho has not once abandoned the line expressed in his newspaper Hoc Tap: "The liberation of South Vietnam can be settled only by force . . . it cannot be settled by treaties and agreements." Mr. Ashmore cares nothing for this.

Last weekend we watched on television Messrs. Harrison Salisbury and David Schoenbrun—two of the handful let into the north—confirming one another's information that the Viet Cong in the south are fiercely independent of Ho Chi Minh—though how they got an objective reading on that in a blinkered visit to the north was not explained. In any case it is not right. The two were almost jocular about Ho's insistence that there are no North Vietnamese troops in the south. It seems that if the President of the U.S. withholds information for reasons of state it is a credibility gap; but when Ho tells a bald lie it is real cute.

Come to think of it. Man of the Year is not enough for Ho. He should also get the Nobel Prize for fiction. The remarkable thing is, he doesn't even have to write his fictions himself.

#### DUAL DRUG PRICES

Mr. NELSON, Mr. President, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee hearings looking into high prescription drug prices has run into some interesting revelations in the past several weeks.

Among them is a document sent to the committee by Mr. George Squibb, until recently a vice president of the drug company bearing his grandfather's name. The theme of his statement is that drug prices are the Achilles heel of the pharmaceutical industry.

He supported the statement with the fact that the drug companies spend only 6.4 percent of their total sales dollar for research—research which FDA Commissioner Goddard suggests is highly inefficient and unproductive—and that the firms cannot blame their high prices on this research cost.

Recently the president of E. R. Squibb & Sons testified to the committee.

Mr. Richard Furlaud attempted to defend the pricing structures the drug companies have set up.

The New York Times on October 17, 1967, editorialized that Mr. Furlaud's defense based on research and on advertising costs was "unpersuasive."

The editorial writer is of the opinion that drug manufacturers still have not presented a "convincing justification" for the "present enormous discrepancies in the prices of branded and generic medicine."

Five drug companies have now appeared to testify before the committee.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association will appear on November 16, November 29, and on another date in December.

I am informed that 15 or 16 PMA witnesses will spend about 16 hours before the committee in order to justify the prescription price system the drug companies use.

I think that should be ample time to prove their case.

I ask unanimous consent that the New

York Times editorial be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### DUAL DRUG PRICES

The president of E. R. Squibb & Sons has given an unpersuasive defense of the curious two-price system for drugs in this country. A much better argument will have to be made to explain why Congress should not outlaw the present anomalous practice under which the same medicine may be very expensive or very cheap, depending upon whether a doctor has prescribed it by its brand name or its generic name.

Taken at face value, the strongest point made by Squibb's president, Richard Furlaud, is the need to cover costs of research aimed at finding new drugs. Unfortunately for the pharmaceutical industry, the force of that argument has been weakened by the recent testimony of Food and Drug Commissioner James L. Goddard. He reported that much of the drug firms' research is "poorly executed" and "has not resulted in the introduction into medical practice of genuinely new therapeutic agents." The relative fruitlessness of this research is, as Dr. Goddard noted, a kind of "expensive inefficiency" whose involuntary subsidization by consumers is hardly justifiable.

Particularly unpersuasive is Mr. Furlaud's effort to defend the huge advertising and promotional spending of the drug industry, costs that are then used to justify the exorbitant prices charged for many branded pharmaceuticals. Every practicing doctor in the nation is deluged with such advertising material, much of which employs themes more appropriate to cigarette or automobile advertising than to the sale of products concerned with human health.

Doubtless, as the drug companies contend, some fraction of this promotional expense does contribute to the education of practicing physicians, but this is surely a far from ideal—or economical—solution to the problem of postgraduate training for clinicians. A drug company advertisement or salesman must aim primarily to sell that enterprise's products—a goal quite different from that of medical educators engaged in bringing up to date the knowledge of their colleagues who actually treat patients.

Passage of a law requiring all drugs to be prescribed and sold by generic names would be an extremely radical step, one that Congress should not take lightly or hastily. But the demand for it will increasingly be heard if the present enormous discrepancies in the prices of branded and generic medicines are not narrowed substantially, and if the drug companies do not give a more convincing justification for the differences that remain.

#### ECONOMY AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the administration apparently is again considering freezing funds for the Federal highway system. While all savings are laudatory during periods of fiscal crisis, cutbacks in the highway construction program would be a dishonest, foolish and even dangerous form of economy. A recent editorial in the *Arizona Republic* placed the issue in proper perspective. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### WHERE TO CUT SPENDING?

President Johnson has spoken often of the dilemma every Chief Executive faces in trying to keep everyone happy, or at least in

trying to keep anyone from being too unhappy.

That dilemma is nowhere more apparent than in the arm-wrestling taking place between LBJ and Congress over how much of the budget should be cut, and where. The House Ways and Means Committee, by a vote of 20-5, said that it would not even consider the President's 10 per cent tax surcharge unless the administration proposes substantial cuts in government spending.

But the administration is reluctant to do so, what with next year being an election year. That is why President Johnson recently summoned reporters to his office to insist that he could not recommend major budget cuts because his original budget was already tight, and the job of cutting appropriations traditionally belongs to Congress.

Nevertheless, the President is casting around for areas in which to cut federal spending. Probably because he knew of the furor his suggestion would arouse, LBJ said the search for frugality might cause him to freeze federal spending for highways.

The lobbyists who stand to gain the most from highway construction naturally joined the nation's governors in condemning the proposed freeze on the \$4.8 billion in federal aid highway funds already apportioned to the states for fiscal 1969. But we also think that would be a foolish place to try to economize.

The fact is that—except for certain forest highways and public land highways—construction of federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban roads has been financed since 1956 from the Highway Trust Fund, which by law operates on a pay-as-you-build basis. Revenues derive from various highway user taxes—on gasoline and diesel fuel, on new trucks and buses, on rubber, lubricating oil, etc.—paid into the Fund.

Thus, highway funds are not in the category of pork-barrel appropriations, voted by Congress and authorized by the President in order to repay political debts. They are funds paid for by motorists who derive benefit from our public highways.

Even if they weren't, it would be wrong to cut back on highway construction. For whereas last year approximately 53,000 people were killed and 4 million injured on the nation's highways (approximately 600 killed and 23,000 injured in Arizona), at an estimated economic loss of \$10 billion (\$115 million in Arizona), 100,000—repeat, 100,000—motorists will die on American highways by about 1980 even if we maintain the present construction rate.

In order to reduce that death rate, we will have to spend even more money. So it should be obvious to everyone—and certainly to the President—that we cannot, under any circumstances, cut back on present highway construction and thereby invite an even greater carnage as a result of outmoded and unsafe roads built for autos of another era.

We approve of the effort to keep federal spending within strict bounds. But we believe the President should look elsewhere in his search for frugality.

#### "A LONG, LONG TRAIL A-WINDING"

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently the distinguished editor in chief of *Forbes* magazine, Mr. Malcolm S. Forbes, in his column called "Fact and Comment," stated that not very many "thinking" people can "fault the President" for his "consistent, determined support of some imaginative efforts toward the conservation of parks, our wilderness areas, and of some remaining unspoiled, unbelievably attractive American scenery."

Mr. Forbes has particular reference to the national trails system supported by

the administration and which I pushed hard for in the 88th Congress.

Again we are at the crossroads of a decision. Action by the Congress can save "a wondrous thing . . . for the mind as well as the muscle," as Mr. Forbes puts it so well.

Out of 2.3 billion acres available in our country, only 220,000 would be kept for nature lovers, hikers, and strollers, and at a fantastically low cost.

Mr. Forbes again says it:

We can't afford that? We cannot not afford it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### LET'S KEEP "A LONG, LONG TRAIL A-WINDING"

The Johnson Administration may have messed up a lot of major programs according to which party you support or which measure gored whose ox, but I don't think that too many thinking Americans will fault the President and the First Lady for their consistent, determined support of some imaginative efforts toward the conservation of parks, our wilderness areas and of some remaining unspoiled, unbelievably attractive American scenery.

To be against "beautifying" of course would be like opposing motherhood, so Administration measures of this nature have seldom been attacked frontally. Ridicule is the weapon. Make the measure seem funny so it gets the teeth laughed out of it.

This has happened in a big way to the federal program aimed at curbing the Billboard Blight, as well as to the effort to curb the crawling sprawl of dead cars, empty iceboxes, cooked-out stoves and sprung bed-springs.

Another really good Administration proposal may bite the dust as a result of invidious attack by leer and sneer.

President Johnson, with the support of both the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, has proposed a National Trails system, with four trails to start it: the 2,000-mile Appalachian Trail from Maine to Georgia; the 825-mile Potomac Heritage Trail through Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia and the District of Columbia; the Pacific Crest Trail, 2,300 miles down the West Coast from Canada to Mexico; and the Continental Divide Trail, 3,100 miles from Southern Canada to southern New Mexico.

I don't know if you have ever taken a walk in the country, or if in your younger years you ever joined contemporary neighboring adventurers on hikes. If you did, you know what a wondrous thing it is for the mind as well as the muscle.

If you never did, you should have and would be the better for it.

One thing sure: In this great land that sheds its light from sea to shining sea, some trails to walk over it should be kept by and for those of us now here, and preserved for those to come.

The bill that would ensure this simple, uncostly good is being attacked on some of the most groundless grounds. One "spokesman" told the Senate Interior Committee that the trails would have a "sweeping and serious impact" on the country's livestock industry and future food supply and that "they would be 20,000 miles of interference with or obliteration of food and fiber production on at least 50,000 acres of land."

"Grandiose and fey" thunders the American Cattlemen's Association.

It is hard to believe that Congressmen would take such guff seriously. Out of the 2.3 billion acres that constitute our continental limits, 220,000 would be kept trilly.



Some big deal.

We can't afford that?

We cannot not afford it.

Look at the muddles we manage to make despite the places still left to walk about in the green of the country. Imagine the mess we'll make when there is no place left to refresh, refurbish the mind.

Congressmen take seriously the testimony of proponents and opponents who make it a business to be heard on measures that may concern them.

They will take even more seriously the spontaneous letters of people who have no angle but their love of our land.

If that includes you, write the men on Capitol Hill.

If enough do, the trailmakers will be heard.

And heeded.

### THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since my days as a college student many years ago, I have regarded the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as one of the greatest newspapers in the world. It is certainly among the top three or four metropolitan dailies in our Nation. On numerous occasions, I have been inspired by the brilliance of its editorial columns.

No other newspaper has been more farsighted and correct in its analysis of our tragic and growing involvement in Vietnam. The melancholy stalemate in which we now find ourselves was forecast by the St. Louis Dispatch long ago.

In an editorial dated October 15, 1967, entitled, "Let's Not Be Children," the editors of the Post-Dispatch have presented one of their finest editorials outlining the fallacies in administration assumptions about Asia and especially Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD, and I urge every Member of Congress to read it with care.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LET'S NOT BE CHILDREN

The alienation of the Johnson Administration from the American people, who have undergone a tidal change of opinion against the Vietnam war, was never more sharply expressed than in Secretary Rusk's vehement press conference last week. With the desperation of a man clinging to a sinking dogma, Mr. Rusk set forth his familiar and increasingly unconvincing rationale for the war, and contemptuously flung out at all who disagree with him by crying, "Let's not be children!"

The American majority which has now beyond doubt swung against the Rusk doctrine will not, we suspect, take kindly to being dismissed with a schoolmasterish charge of infantilism. If it is childish to question Mr. Rusk's obsession with a Chinese menace which only he perceives, and to doubt that America's vital security interests demand our fighting an Asian war which the South Vietnamese themselves will not fight, then a great and growing number of Americans are consigned to something less than the mature wisdom which Mr. Rusk claims for himself.

Dissenters from his policy, Mr. Rusk said, put the nation in "mortal danger" and risk a "catastrophe for mankind" by placing in question the credibility of American "commitments" under the Southeast Asia treaty. The people are entitled to ask what has become of the commitment made to them by

President Johnson when he sought election in 1964 on a peace platform directly contrary to the Vietnam policy he has followed since. The "pledged word" cited by Mr. Rusk as justification for endless involvement in an Asian land war conflicts with the pledged word of Mr. Johnson not to send Americans to fight Asians' battles. Which promise is the more important?

But it is, of course, untrue to say that half a million troops and a vast air-naval armada are in Vietnam to carry out a solemn national commitment. There never was a commitment, either by President Eisenhower or President Kennedy, to make the civil war in Vietnam our own, and both of their administrations refrained from doing so. President Johnson is exclusively responsible for converting a program of aid and advice into a unilateral war. The Southeast Asia treaty did not require such escalation. By undertaking it unilaterally we violated our most solemn commitments under the United Nations charter.

If Mr. Rusk is right in saying we must wage a war like this in order to sustain world faith in our treaty commitments, then it follows that we have an inescapable obligation to fight other people's wars for them in every quarter of the globe. He is preaching a doctrine of unlimited military intervention under which America sets itself up as judge and jury of every revolution, every border dispute, every national conflict, and undertakes to decide them with its own power.

The American people are rebelling against this doctrine. They do not find credible any longer Mr. Rusk's claims that we are fighting in Vietnam to protect a vital national interest in blocking the expansion of Chinese Communism. It is clearly not China we are fighting, nor Communism either, but rather an indigenous nationalism determined to throw off the remnants of colonial rule which offers a far stronger barrier to Chinese expansion than a puppet government supported by permanent American military occupation. And it is permanent American occupation, let there be no doubt about it, which Mr. Rusk is advocating. If our national interest in Vietnam is as vital as he claims, we could not afford to entrust it to a Saigon government which would not survive two weeks without our support.

The American people do not demand precipitate and reckless withdrawal from Vietnam, though more and more of them are beginning to tolerate even that idea. This newspaper does not favor such withdrawal. We are convinced, however, that a peaceful settlement could be obtained, on the basis of the Geneva agreements, if the United States adopted negotiable objectives and stepped down the war instead of steadily stepping it up.

Mr. Rusk insists he is ready to negotiate, that only Hanoi is unwilling. What he is ready to negotiate, however, is Hanoi's surrender—the abandonment of the Viet Cong by North Vietnam, thus leaving the field clear for the Saigon regime backed by our then unchallenged military power.

It is no mystery that Hanoi refuses to negotiate on these terms, under the intimidation of aerial bombardment. But there is every reason to believe that Hanoi would negotiate a compromise settlement which gave the Viet Cong a place in the country's political future commensurate with its strength, which contemplated the ultimate withdrawal of all foreign troops and settlement of their political differences by the South Vietnamese people themselves—if these ever became America's objectives.

An honorable alternative to endless war does exist, and more and more Americans are coming to insist upon it. We have a feeling that if this Administration cannot find the wit or will to work its way out of the Vietnam morass, the American people—or "children," if Mr. Rusk prefers that word—will elect an administration which can.

### THE DANGERS OF DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the American public is increasingly feeling the many deep sacrifices involved in our long and bitter struggle in Vietnam. With this increasing awareness of the cost of defending freedom, some are responding with a wave of excessive criticism directed at President Johnson and his handling of the war. I would like to take a few moments today to survey some of the effects of this excessive criticism, for I believe they are potentially much more damaging than most of those who utter them have so far realized.

The right to criticize, to dissent from public policy, is of course fundamental to our system of government. I am not one who feels that this is a fine right as long as it remains unexercised, at least not exercised during wartime. It must be exercised whenever people find grounds for criticism, whether in war or in peace. And there is, of course, no assurance that such criticism will always be logical or well founded.

Surely our democracy has great room for tolerance for many kinds of dissent. And yet, some types of criticism are indeed posing dangers. Let us review some of the things that are being threatened today through abuses of the right of dissent.

The Presidency represents both a man and an office. It is an office of great prestige, probably the most widely respected office on earth. On the respect and prestige of that office, much of the Nation's influence in the world depends. I would like to associate myself with the comments of our distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, when he said not long ago that you do not demean the President in the eyes of the people abroad "for when you do, you demean the prestige of this Republic. And I do not mean to do it, as the one remaining, great, free republic on the face of the earth"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1967, page 27577. I think all of us would do well to keep Senator DIRKSEN's warning in mind. Certainly we can keep any criticisms within the framework of respect for the Office of President.

The President is not only the Republic's sole organ in foreign relations and the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; he is also charged with the execution of our national laws. Only he—not the Congress—nor the Supreme Court—has the constitutional responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed. It can be a severe blow to the maintenance of domestic law and order generally when respect for the Presidency is undermined at home. The current spirit of defiance of law which is abroad in our land will only receive encouragement from those whose criticism goes beyond the bounds of respectful dissent.

Respect for the Office of President implies, too, I believe, a respect for the constitutional power of the President to direct the Armed Forces of the United States. This authority arises from his powers as Commander in Chief. Some of the criticism of the President seems to be based on the assumption that the Congress, rather than the President, should

determine the manner in which the war in Vietnam is conducted. We have had a tragic warning in this regard. During the Civil War, the Congress established a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, perhaps the most powerful and controversial investigating committee ever set up by the Congress. It conducted sweeping inquiries into the conduct of military operations and the management of the Union war effort. But it did far more than investigate. It tried to usurp some of Lincoln's powers as Commander in Chief. Among other practices which have received widespread criticism, its members made a practice of traveling into the field, of calling military officers. The results, as might be expected, were of near-disaster proportions on military morale and on many aspects of the conduct of the war.

It is hardly necessary to labor the point that destructive criticism of the President and of the war effort at home adversely affects the course of events in Vietnam itself. My hat is off to the resolve and fortitude of our men in Vietnam. They endure indescribable hardships while many at home engage in criticism that is neither respectful nor constructive. But however high their morale may be, their difficult task halfway around the globe could be made much lighter if those who criticize intemperately were to take more account of their understandable feelings. The factor which no doubt hurts our troops more is the false encouragement which destructive criticism lends to the Hanoi regime and the forces seeking to take over South Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh knows that there is now no hope of military victory over South Vietnam. His only hope, and a very misguided one it is, lies in the discouragement and ultimate withdrawal of the United States and our allies from South Vietnam. Unfortunately, he can draw encouragement from the violent, disrespectful, and theatrical manner in which so much of our dissent is cloaked today.

There is much that is said today which seems to support such a mistaken impression. There is almost a form of "one-upmanship" in some quarters—a sort of political competition to see who can hit the President the hardest. This could reach disaster proportions as the presidential election of 1968 approaches. The real defeat would be for the country as a whole. My hope is that people will increasingly distinguish between politicians who criticize constructively and those who criticize for purely partisan purposes or in disrespect of the fundamental values of freedom.

Their actions, Mr. President, brand them as beneath contempt. Their brand of opportunism will give comfort to all those who doubt the ability of democracy to act in crisis. Indeed, democracy would be rendered impotent if the ship of state offered its helm to opportunists willing to trade on their country's agony for fleeting political expediency.

Events in Washington last weekend illustrate the kind of chaos that can result when responsibility gives way to angry emotion and the communications by which we reach national decisions break down for want of respect of basic American institutions. Those individuals who

participated in the march on the Pentagon have demonstrated that they are neither worthy nor ready to participate in intelligent, dispassionate and reasoned dialog, which is so essential to our national goals.

The President has been doing the best he can under the most trying of circumstances. Surely his policies should be criticized. I ask only that the criticism be constructive, that it be respectful, and that it show some regard for the men who are defending this country's security 12,000 miles away.

If the President succeeds, it will not be his victory. It will be the victory of America's fighting men. If the President fails—and I pray this event will not come to pass—then it will not be his failure so much as it will be a disaster for the country and for the men who have been called upon to answer their country's call.

#### VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with respect to airpower utilization in Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that testimony under the heading, "Enables Enemy To Get Wise," of Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, U.S. Air Force, retired, before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on August 29 be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF MAJ. GEN. GILBERT L. MEYERS, USAF, RETIRED, BEFORE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

#### ENABLES ENEMY TO GET WISE

Mr. KENDALL. Would not the North Vietnamese get wise to that practice and say, well, it was hit today and it was not knocked out so they would build up their defenses around that particular target?

General MEYERS. Very much so. This is why we wanted a greater number of targets to work on in a given period of time, so we could attack with small flights. If they destroyed the target, fine. If they did not, we would move to a different area, and work on that target, and if we were successful, fine. We would move back and attack the other one. Using that approach, the enemy would not know where we were going to attack next.

We ended up with a very stereotyped operation due to the limited number of targets that we had available. We were convinced that we lost many pilots in attacking these targets which would not have been necessary had we had a greater number to select from. We recognized that there were political constraints associated with attacking various targets, but once you accepted the facts that a target system should be destroyed, turn that system over to the military and let them work on it based on weather factors and forces available and various other military considerations. The existing practice of doing out the targets one, two, and three at a time is too restrictive and results in more pilot and airplane losses.

For example, if it is decided that the bridges on a given line of communication should be destroyed, give that line of communications with the five or 10 bridges that might exist to the military planners and let them select what bridge should be hit at a given point in time.

You know the weather over there is very critical. It runs roughly on the north-south line. That is, the west is in the monsoon period when the east is not, and vice versa

at other times of the year. Consequently the targets should be spread as far across the country as possible to give maximum flexibility of attacking them when the weather is best.

Mr. KENDALL. Have you finished? I do not wish to interrupt.

General MEYERS. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. As distinguished from that, as I understand it, as to each specific bridge, at least during this period, and each barrack and each other fixed target you had to come back to Washington to get specific approval to hit it; is that correct?

General MEYERS. That is correct on all fixed targets of that type.

#### NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the failure of the National Governors' Conference to consider a resolution in support of the administration's Vietnam policy has had a far greater effect than it deserves both at home and abroad.

Few Governors are actively engaged in the formulation or implementation of the Nation's foreign policy. Their day-to-day contact with the problems of Vietnam is limited. Nevertheless, by the very nature of their office, it is assumed that Governors are especially well informed about the attitudes of their own citizens. Hence it follows—although not with complete logic—that their statements in regard to national policy reflect the consensus of public thought within their jurisdictional borders. They managed to forget all about this in the political pressures present during the Caribbean cruise.

Partisan political consideration motivated a good deal of what went on there. Nevertheless, the Republican Governors had a remarkable opportunity to present solid-front support to the President's Vietnam policy. And they failed to take advantage of it.

To point out that the Republican Governors merely refused to consider a Vietnam resolution is to evade the issue. Ostensibly, they did not wish to approve the administration's present course of action. And this led, inevitably, to the easily arrived at conclusion that they disapproved.

Approximately half the Governors present were Republican, official spokesmen for about half the population of the United States. They failed to speak out, clearly and forcibly, in support of what this Nation is doing in Southeast Asia. Their reticence encourages military dissent at home, hardens the resolve in Hanoi to prolong the conflict and limits the President's freedom of action.

The political factors involved in the Republican decision have already been lost in the more obvious failure, per se, to support a solid, nonpartisan front. The implied disapproval of present policy provided respectability—and, perhaps, prestige—to militant individuals and groups who oppose the war. This respectability enables the radical fringe to preach "anarchy" under the cloak of "dissent," to advocate "disorder" in the name of "protest."

Thus, as the demonstrations grow in number, intensity and violence, there is reaction in Hanoi, and Peking and Mos-



cow. It is not difficult for foreign observers to misinterpret what is happening here. The size and significance of the dissent has no doubt been exaggerated.

However, the specific dissent, implicit in the Republican Governors' failure to support present policy, has encouraged belief in Hanoi that a change of administration in the United States will create a more benign climate for achievement of its objectives.

I could suggest there is more than coincidence in this week's announcement from Hanoi that there will be no negotiations whatsoever in regard to Vietnam until after the 1968 presidential election.

Even more dangerous, the Republican decision seriously inhibits the President's course of action. Since the present policy is one of limited military effort to achieve limited political objectives, the GOP abstention was, by implication, certainly, a repudiation of that policy. It poses the fascinating question about the Republican position. In which direction does it lean? Toward escalation to the point of invading North Vietnam? Or toward complete and unconditional withdrawal?

The President's political expertise is unquestioned. He recognizes the reasons for the Republican Governors' reluctance. As he has done in the past, he will continue to resist efforts to tug him away from the firm, middle-ground course he has steadfastly sustained.

The administration's consistency of policy does not diminish the danger of the Republican Governors' action during the conference. The conduct of the war is—or should be—above the reach of partisan politics. For the Republican Governors to have superimposed political considerations upon a matter of such vital national welfare indicates a lack of responsibility toward the people whose interests they are sworn to preserve.

#### PLAIN DEALER NEWS ITEMS RESULTED IN SAVING TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. President, recently when speaking on the Defense Department announcement of new rules for firms seeking defense contracts to assure compliance with the Truth in Negotiating Act, I had printed in the Record two articles which appeared in the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio. At that time I commended both the Plain Dealer and Sanford Watzman, its Washington bureau reporter, for focusing national attention on gross mismanagement in contracting procedures in the Defense Department and had two Plain Dealer articles printed in the Record. I reiterate that praise today. Inadvertently a part of one item was omitted.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the articles entitled "Pentagon Yields, Orders Defense Contract Audits," and "PD Stories Got Action," which were published in the Plain Dealer on October 3, be printed in the Record. I congratulate Sanford Watzman and the Plain Dealer for accomplishing a substantial savings of taxpayers' money. Pentagon yielded; ordered audits.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 3, 1967]

#### PENTAGON YIELDS, ORDERS DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDITS

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department has finally agreed to launch an audit program aimed at assuring a fair price on key defense contracts.

The move will strengthen enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act, which is supposed to protect the government against profiteering by companies selling weapons and other war material.

The decision was made known yesterday when copies of a Pentagon order were personally delivered to the offices of Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Cleveland, and Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., by Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas D. Morris.

Both legislators have criticized Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara for not making full use of the law. Last June 6 they introduced legislation to goad the Pentagon into making more audits.

A series of Plain Dealer articles last April focused public attention on this loophole in the program. Congressional hearings resulted, followed by introduction of the Proxmire and Minshall bills.

The new Pentagon order was regarded as achieving the purpose of the identical Minshall and Proxmire bills. In effect, McNamara now has agreed to do on his own what the lawmakers were proposing to force him to do through an amendment to the "Truth" act.

The order also means that the Defense Department has acceded to demands that it assume the major responsibility for detecting overpricing of contracts and starting action for a refund to the government when overcharges are found.

Until now McNamara has been relying on Congress' General Accounting Office (GAO). Over a 10-year period GAO has uncovered overpricing at the rate of \$13 million a year.

This has resulted from minimal spot-checking by GAO, which has a relatively small auditing force. With its own vastly superior army of auditors, the Pentagon will be able to check systematically a far larger number of contracts.

Assistant Defense Secretary Morris suggested to aides of Minshall and Proxmire that the lawmakers might now choose not to push their bills—so the Pentagon will have an opportunity to test the effectiveness of the order. Both Minshall and Proxmire were away when Morris called.

The five-paragraph edict was dated last Friday. It was in the form of a memorandum, under the letterhead of the secretary of defense. It was signed by deputy secretary Paul H. Nitze, No. 2 man at the Pentagon.

A defense spokesman explained that Nitze had acted for McNamara, who was at a NATO conference in Turkey last week. The memo is addressed to Morris and other ranking defense officials, including the secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

John M. Malloy, Morris' deputy, told The Plain Dealer it will take about 30 days before the order reaches all defense procurement offices and is put into effect.

Purchasing officials are commanded to include in future contracts a provision granting defense department auditors the right to examine corporate records after a contract is completed. This would be a condition of the contract.

The purpose is to determine whether the contractor had acted in good faith at the time of negotiations—that is, whether he had supplied to the government accurate, current and complete information in figuring his costs.

The estimate of material and labor costs is one of the chief elements involved when corporations and the Pentagon agree on the price to be paid for military hardware. Profit allowed the contractor is based on this estimate.

The order covers the so-called firm fixed price (FFP) contracts used in most major procurements. More and more such contracts have been signed since McNamara became defense secretary in 1961.

Once the price is agreed on, the contractor assumes all the risks. He may end up making money or losing money. If his own efficiency entitles him to greater profits than anticipated, he is entitled to keep the extra money—providing he is not found to have deliberately overstated his probable costs.

McNamara favors FFP over an older form of contract, known as the cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF). Under the latter, the contractor is guaranteed a profit no matter how inefficient he may have been in regulating overhead costs.

Because GAO found cases where contractors had not been entirely frank with the government, it urged the Pentagon to follow the GAO lead and to begin a comprehensive audit program.

The recommendation was made two years ago. After considerable delay, McNamara agreed to go along—but excluded the FFPs from his new audit program, reserving his decision on the multi-million-dollar contracts.

McNamara's advisors split on the GAO recommendation as it pertained to the FFPs. His auditors urged him to accept the proposal and aggressively to implement it.

But the secretary's procurement people warned McNamara that this might damage relations with many contractors on whom the government is dependent for materiel.

The procurement men argued that an audit after a fixed price is "second guessing" the contractor, thereby undermining the incentive principle of FFP.

McNamara's long-awaited decision came in the face of mounting criticism in Congress. Another congressional panel, the subcommittee for special investigations of the House Armed Services Committee, opened hearings last week.

Members of that group accused the Pentagon of stalling. At that point the Defense Department had not yet filed its comments on the June 6 Proxmire-Minshall legislation.

GAO spokesmen told The Plain Dealer they were gratified by the decision. But they quickly added it is now up to the Pentagon to prove by its enforcement actions that new legislation really is not needed.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 3, 1967]

#### PD STORIES GOT ACTION

WASHINGTON.—The new Pentagon policy on auditing of defense contracts is the third positive response by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to articles in The Plain Dealer, beginning last April.

The newspaper brought to light hitherto obscure reports of the General Accounting Office, a congressional agency, which charged McNamara with weak enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating act.

Last May, the Defense Department, under fire from Congress' Joint Economic Committee because of The Plain Dealer disclosures, announced proposals for new regulations requiring documentation of the "truth" certificates.

Contractors have been given an opportunity to comment. A final draft of the new code is expected later this year.

A second major criticism was lack of teamwork by Defense Department personnel in implementing the four-year-old law and apparent misconceptions about its provisions.

The response was organizing of truth-in-negotiating "seminars" for defense procurement personnel across the country. A conference on the issue for Pentagon officials is scheduled for Oct. 30 at Hershey, Pa.

The new edict on auditing will serve an additional check by detecting overcharges after contracts are completed.

## RAILWAY POST OFFICE SERVICE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have been an outspoken opponent of the policies of the Post Office Department relative to the discontinuance of railway post office cars.

Many other Members of Congress, from both parties, and in both Houses, have expressed similar opposition. Our voices have not been heard by the Post Office Department, however, and now nearly every long-distance passenger train still operating in the United States is threatened with discontinuance proceedings because of the loss of RPO service.

Hundreds of organizations and groups across the country have expressed grave concern over this latest development, and have proposed action of one sort or another. But one group has taken what I consider to be extremely appropriate action under the circumstances. The National Association of Railroad Passengers, through its executive director, Mr. Anthony Haswell, has wired the President, asking him to reverse the present policies of the Post Office Department. It would appear at this point, that only the President would be able to undo what has already been done. I sincerely hope that he responds favorably to this telegram, for the economic harm which the policies of the Post Office Department have already caused is irreparable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Haswell's telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President,  
White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Santa Fe Railroad has announced plans to discontinue most of its passenger trains on account of termination of railway post office service by the Post Office Department. In recent months, other train discontinuance plans have been announced by other railroads for the same reason. Our information is that several other railroads will soon follow Santa Fe in proposing drastic cutbacks in passenger service, also on grounds that post office action in discontinuing RPO cars will deprive the trains of vitally needed revenue.

The National Association of Railroad Passengers is made up of users of railroad passenger service and other concerned citizens who believe that passenger trains are essential and valuable, and should be preserved and improved rather than discontinued. The association objects to the present policy of the post office department, in that it clearly endangers the continued operation of much needed and useful passenger service.

The association does not insist that present patterns of mail transportation be frozen indefinitely. However, we do believe that no more RPO cars should be discontinued until a thorough study can be made of the potential for rail passenger transportation throughout the United States. If RPO cars are removed from the trains before completion of such a study, many of the trains will likely be discontinued, thus rendering the study an academic exercise. History teaches us that once a given passenger train is discontinued, it is seldom if ever restored. On the other hand, if mail is retained on the trains for the time being, we will have the opportunity to determine which passenger train service should be preserved and improved, and what steps are necessary to ensure their continued operation in the most

efficient and economical manner possible, with or without mail transportation.

Postal officials have alleged that the recent changes in mail transportation will provide better mail service at lower cost, and that therefore the department cannot "subsidize" the railroads by paying a higher price for an inferior transportation service. However, we point out that the department has never provided intelligible figures to prove its allegation that the new methods are saving money. Furthermore, reports from many parts of the country indicate that mail service has gotten worse, not better, since the institution of the "sectional center" system and the demise of many RPO cars. The department has rejected constructive suggestions for improvement of RPO service, and has refused to participate in experiments for faster mail hauling in conjunction with the high speed train service soon to begin between New York and Washington. But even if the department's claims were true, the timing of its actions shows a callous disregard of the public interest in view of the certain destructive effect these actions will have on passenger train service before the future scope and form of such service can be adequately determined.

We conclude that the unilateral, arbitrary, and preemptory action of the post office department in terminating railway post office service is unjustifiable and contrary to the national interest. Accordingly, we respectfully urge that you initiate a thorough study and investigation of the nationwide potential for rail passenger service, and that you request the post office department to reinstate and/or continue the operation of all RPO cars which were in service as of September 1 of this year, until completion of the study.

ANTHONY HASWELL,  
Executive Director, National Association  
of Railroad Passengers.  
CHICAGO, ILL.

## OUR CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the question of our action in Vietnam is more than a political question. It is a question of conscience.

For this reason, as rarely in the past, church bodies—the National Council of Churches, official nationwide denominational meetings, regional and local religious groups—have spoken out on our national dilemma. Across the country, pastors of churches have expressed their views from the pulpit.

One such is the Reverend Dr. Guy D. Carpenter, senior minister of the Methodist Temple in Evansville, Ind., who preached a sermon on September 24 with the title "Our Christian Conscience and Vietnam." Dr. Carpenter did not speak until he had studied the question, read much on the subject, and reached the conclusions he preached—as many of us have done—on the basis of conviction derived from analysis of the facts.

For that reason, Mr. President—because this is a strong sermon looking at the evidence in the light of Christian conviction, not because Dr. Carpenter is a minister in my home city—I ask unanimous consent that the text of his sermon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## OUR CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

No one—almost no one—"likes" the war in Vietnam. In the vivid bluntness of General Sherman of Civil War days, war is always

"hell". This one today is dirty, messy, hard, bloody, and bitter. Those are reasons not to "like" the war in Vietnam; but more than that, the issues involved are the most complicated and confused ever faced by Americans. In past wars we believed—rightly or wrongly—that we were fighting for something: independence in the Revolutionary War, to preserve the union in the Civil War, to "make the world safe for democracy" in the First World War, to destroy totalitarianism in World War II. But what is the issue in Vietnam? Will we by armed might halt the advance of Communism?

Few people are perfectly clear about what is right or wrong, or what is to be done. Some are determined that—bad as it is—there we must stay, see it through . . . and win!

Whatever our personal opinion, this we know: the war in Vietnam is becoming more brutal; it is taking a heavier toll of civilian lives; it is escalating; it is endangering international trust—as did race riots this past summer.

Where is the voice of the Christian?

As Dr. Robert McAfee Brown says in his book: "A time comes when the issues are so momentous that not speaking is a greater sin even than speaking wrongly. For wrong speech can at least elicit right speech, whereas silence implies consent to an evil that because of the silence escapes unchallenged."

Hear then the voice of the Church! And it is not just the pulpit of the Methodist Temple, it is churches and synagogues across this land. The three major religious traditions—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—while on many issues we are divided, on the issue of Vietnam we are not. As a devastating war grinds on we must take account of the Old Testament prophets and the gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, and be willing to face the moral implications before it is too late.

How did the United States become involved in Vietnam? Some highly responsible men like Richard N. Goodwin, Senator McGovern, and the writer, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., agree that it was "almost by accident." It is nearly unbelievable. "For nine years following 1945 we denied the people of Vietnam the right to independence. For nine years we financially supported the French in their . . . effort to recolonize Vietnam. Before the end of the war we were meeting 80% of the French war costs." They were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, but before that, the French were despairing of their reckless actions. But we encouraged them with many dollars and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will.

Former President Eisenhower considered sending bombers to the surrounded French. Lyndon Johnson—then Senator—firmly refused to endorse military intervention.

During the election year of 1964, even President Johnson was saying: "We don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia . . . We are not about to send American boys 9 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves."

But we now have the war! Our boys are miles from home doing what Asian boys did not do. We didn't officially declare war, but we are paying billions of dollars to continue it.

I. The fire power the Americans are exerting in Vietnam is enormous, well nigh unbelievable. General Dayan, the now-famous military hero of Israel, recently reported from the scene in Vietnam that more shells were fired in a single engagement in a single night than in whole wars in the past. The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported this startling fact: "By December 31, 1966, the United States had dropped a total of almost 800,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam—more than Germany got during the entire Second World War."

Those who saw some of those horrible ruins from bombs in Europe will marvel at the



fact that ruins today may be worse; and we may be at it longer. Already we have been waging war in Vietnam longer than America has ever waged any war in our history! Military experts are predicting that from 5 to 15 years may yet be needed for us to "win". Will much of anything be left of that benighted land?

One wonders—are we men of blood, or men of peace? Watch a few actual scenes from this war on television;—it makes us uneasy!

II. Will we ever learn it? *Force always develops resistance.* It isn't a military law, but it is the way people react. Force stiffens the will to resist. Strategic bombing has proved in the past to be clumsy, bloody, and very inefficient; far from breaking a people's spirit, it rallies them round their leaders.

It was the *New York Times*, in January this year, that reported: "The morale of the people in Hanoi is clearly not being destroyed, but solidified by the bombing."

Professor Reischauer, "a life-long specialist in Oriental studies and former ambassador to Japan," points out that our increased bombing and destruction of property is stiffening the will of the Viet Cong to resist us; it drives uninvolved people into their ranks, rather than diminishing their power.

Didn't many of us observe it once in our lifetime? When the Nazis stepped up their bombing of Britain it only strengthened the determination and solidified the resistance. Prime Minister Churchill called that "their finest hour!"

To defeat communism is our policy; and we have united the Communism world with our bombs and power, and divided the free world! Who in the world is for us?

III. *It's a Different Kind of War.* We have used fiendish new weapons. Among these are napalm and chemicals to defoliate and render useless for harvest the soil for many years to come. The use of napalm is commonplace. It is a so-called "superior brand" with better "adhesive" qualities, which means—bluntly—that the burning white-hot jelly cannot be scraped off the skin, nor extinguished with water, and its burning disfigures, produces prolonged agony, and often kills! It does not distinguish between combat soldiers, nursing mothers, children, and aged grandparents.

"If this is liberation, it is liberation for starvation and ruin."

It is a war in which civilian casualties are greater than military. Napalm has made this a dreadful fact; plus bombing of villages and heavy jungle fire. Correspondents like Neil Sheehan have reported far more civilians being killed than soldiers; about half the civilians killed are children; the lowest ratio of civilian to military deaths is 3 to 1; the highest is 9 to 1.

How short our memories are as a nation! In World War II the Nazis attacked cities, killed civilians, leveled towns to the ground and departed destroying fields. It was called a "scorched earth" policy, and we were horrified! We condemned both people and actions at the Nuremberg trials.

But where is our national outrage as we are doing precisely the same thing now in Vietnam? Is it any wonder that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, called this mismatch between United States technology and a small undeveloped nation "one of the 'most barbarous' wars in history"?

It's a different kind of war in Vietnam. Many of the enemy are not in uniform; it's difficult to distinguish a Vietcong from a native. Henry Cabot Lodge, who has spent years as our official representative in Vietnam, considers the highly trained "guerrilla terrorist"—they number about 150,000—in the various villages to be the "real cancer."

We are trying to ferret them out with fire power and napalm. We can't be certain whether a non-uniformed Vietnamese is a Vietcong, so we hurl our napalm; we burn a village; we defoliate the fields. We trust we

are cremating a Vietcong—only to discover to our dismay that we created a Vietcong! If the native's loved ones are hurt, his home destroyed, his livelihood shattered—why not join the force that is fighting back against this massive power that is claiming to liberate him?

IV. *At this moment we are at an impasse.* We will not cease bombing until there is a sign from the other side of a willingness to negotiate. The other side indicates it will give no sign until we stop bombing.

It was *The Saturday Evening Post* that asked Secretary-General U Thant to take steps to bring about a negotiated settlement, and he declared immediately "the first step would be for the U.S. to stop bombing North Vietnam, not for a brief 'pause' but permanently and unconditionally."

But the Administration has ignored this, and President Johnson has said just this week that he is satisfied with our present policy. "It's worth the price."

The President has on several occasions questioned the loyalty of those who oppose him, referring to them as "nervous Nellies." We have reason to be nervous. I would change the term, however. Not "nervous Nellies" but "Concerned Christians." Concerned over the increasing chorus of warning voices from Far-Eastern experts and other nations; concerned over the increasing momentum pushing toward an abyss; concerned over policies that are uniting the Communist world while dividing the Free World; concerned over the ghastly cost in human life.

"Blessed are the peacemakers," said Jesus, "for they shall be called the children of God." Those who seek peace are not traitors. Those who desperately seek peace in an unfortunate spot in the world are subject to the "hard, clean question" in Jesus' powerful parable of the Last Judgment: What did you do for those in need? Yes, we have the needy right here in Evansville; but we have them in a special way in Vietnam.

Dare we answer the question—Have we, in Vietnam, created hunger by defoliating their crops? Have we made them sick and lonesome by killing children and civilians with napalm and bombing their villages?

There is an old word—a Biblical word dominating both Jewish and Christian scriptures. That word is "Repent!" And we had better not forget what it means! It means "Turn around—begin again—make a fresh start." It is never easy, and it is hardest of all for the nation. But God walks with us along a difficult and often discouraging road. God will sustain the nation if we invoke Him; God will judge us harshly if we continue to ignore His ways, and will "... hold us accountable for the horror we continue to unleash."

Many—far too many—young Americans have died in Vietnam. Let us work and pray that they shall not have died in vain. And they shall not if we are big enough as a nation to admit our mistakes and to know that there is more honor in self-correction than in "saving face."

V. *What are the alternatives?* One is to win the war as quickly as possible, escalate rapidly, and use nuclear warheads if necessary. The destruction and loss of life among the enemy would be immense, and we could conceivably ignite World War III.

Another alternative is to withdraw; "tuck tail and run," as President Johnson has described it. But this is not feasible. It would imply that a weak nation had defeated a strong nation. It would imply that thousands of young American lives had been given in vain. It would be an open invitation to Communism to go elsewhere and do likewise.

If these are the only alternatives there seems to be no other course but to continue as we are. But suppose there is yet a third possibility—long and tortuous, not easy, for history does not present us with easy choices? We can seek now for a negotiated peace. It is not withdrawing our forces and our voice.

It is "remaining in strength" by withdrawing to key defensive points and halting our bombing in the North. It is "quieting the war." Let us wait for Ho Chi Minh to come to the conference table. It is sitting down with every combatant in the war; that includes the Vietcong. This is a policy stubbornly opposed by President Johnson.

It is amazing at times how some events happen "coincidentally." In July, I read the powerful book, *Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience*, and determined to preach a sermon on this critical subject on the first Sunday the student body had returned to the University of Evansville. Now—coincidentally—highly respected and influential religious leaders of Judaism, Protestantism, and Catholicism have, meanwhile, put out a clarion call for a million signatures of church people in America to a petition to be signed on a Sunday or Sabbath in September and forwarded to a convocation early in October of business, labor, civic, political, and religious leaders in Washington, D.C. This position will be handed to Senators, Representatives, and administration officials. The movement is known as "Negotiation Now!" The petition supports U Thant and the United Nations in new negotiations, calls for the halting of our nation's bombing of North Vietnam and the taking of further initiative leading to truce. It asks that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front respond affirmatively to our initiative leading to a standstill ceasefire. It asks that South Vietnam respect and join in these steps.

Peace without victory! Peace without further bloodshed and destruction! Putting an end to war—is there anything more Christian? Being mindful of the words of the late John F. Kennedy, speaking before the United Nations, "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind," let us Christians do something besides wringing our hands and murmuring "how awful." We can do something to assist the power and influence of the Church and Synagogue. We can be the body of Christ, even though we take our licks and are broken and bruised...

After a cross, that "body" may rise again, as it happened that first Easter!

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND'S FIRST COMMERCIAL FISHERIES SCHOOL, OCTOBER 19, 1967

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in two areas today the United States has fallen steadily in its world ranking. I am thinking particularly of offshore fisheries and the merchant marine.

I am happy to say that in Rhode Island, the University of Rhode Island at Kingston is host to a new program which should help to reverse the trend of national weakness in the field of fisheries. At URI a 2-year program has just been opened to train men for a life in commercial fishing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "URI Fisheries College Unique in Nation," published in the *Westerly, R.I., Sun* of October 4, 1967, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### URI FISHERIES COLLEGE UNIQUE IN NATION

Twenty-five young men have started classes in the first college curriculum of its kind in the country—a two-year program at the University of Rhode Island to train men for the commercial fisheries.

Members of the first class are mostly recent high school graduates, but include a few men in their 30's. The students come from as far away as Alaska, California and Puerto

Rico, although most are from the northeast states. Thirteen are from Rhode Island.

The curriculum combines classroom theory in subjects such as physics, marine technology, fishery hydrography and marketing, and sea-borne experience aboard a training vessel and trawlers at nearby Point Judith in subjects such as navigation and fishing gear. Graduates will receive an associate in science degree.

The curriculum has been designed to give the best possible education to potential captains and mates of the fishing fleet, and to individuals who wish to work in related marine industries such as processing and marketing.

Operated through a department of fisheries and marine technology in the University of Rhode Island's College of Agriculture, the program is headed by a 33-year-old British-born naval architect, Dr. John C. Sainsbury. He was chairman of the department of naval architecture and shipbuilding at the College of Fisheries in St. John's, Newfoundland, before coming to Rhode Island to direct the new program.

"Many of the students here come from a fishing background," Dr. Sainsbury said, "while others are from families with no history in the sea or fishing. They share without exception, however, an intense interest and belief in the commercial fisheries and its future, and are all entering wholeheartedly into what is a very time-consuming schedule for a university program."

The students must take six hours of classes and laboratories every weekday except Friday afternoon, in addition to studies that must be done on their own outside those hours.

A 47-foot former oceanographic research vessel, the Gall Ann, is being converted for fisheries training. When it is put back in the water, the students will alternate taking work trips at sea. They are also required to work aboard a variety of commercial fishing vessels during the summer after their first year.

A building at the former Photek plant in nearby West Kingston is being used for laboratories in seamanship, nets and fishing gear technology, navigation, vessel engineering and electronics until a new facility can be built in the Point Judith fishing port area.

Dr. Sainsbury said interest in the program is increasing and that inquiries are already being received from young people inside and outside the United States for the 40 places that will be available in the entering class next year.

Thirteen of the students in the first class are Rhode Islanders, including Paul S. Schauer of 10 West Beach Street, Westerly; Gary A. Brooks, Edward A. Conley and Marshall Rose of Block Island and Dennis W. Webster and Robert B. Westcott.

One of the two students from Connecticut is Bohdan Mutz of North Stonington.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

## CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution

(H.J. Res. 888) making appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 888, as reported to the Senate, provides continuing authority until November 15, 1967, rather than the date of November 23, 1967, as provided in the resolution as it passed the House.

This resolution is necessary to provide authority in those cases where the appropriation bills have not been enacted into law. As of today, six of the regular annual appropriation bills have been sent to the White House for signature. There are five appropriation bills in conference, or the conferences have been concluded but the conference reports have not been agreed to in both Houses.

There is one appropriation bill in the Senate Committee on Appropriations—the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The committee has been holding on this bill pending enactment into law of the new revenue act for the District. It is difficult to attempt to make decisions on how much should be appropriated until the committee has received firm estimates on the revenue for the District of Columbia.

One bill is on the House Calendar—the military construction appropriation bill.

The remaining two appropriation bills—the foreign assistance appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill—are pending in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting authorizing legislation—principally the poverty program in the case of the supplemental and, of course, the foreign assistance authorization in the other instance.

The committee has expressed the hope that action can be completed on all of these appropriation bills by November 15, in which event further amendment to the continuing resolution would be unnecessary.

The resolution, as referred to the Senate committee, contained several provisions unrelated to a continuing resolution, which have been stricken by the committee. These provisions were designed to effect economies in Federal expenditures by blind, across-the-board reductions.

While the appropriations process may not be perfect, nevertheless, it has evolved over a period of many years and affords the most logical method of providing funds for Government operations.

The delay in the appropriation bills is undesirable. However, in most instances, this delay results from the fact that it is necessary, under the rules of the two bodies, for authorizing legislation to be enacted into law prior to making the appropriation.

All of the appropriation bills have been reported to the House by the House Committee on Appropriations except the foreign assistance appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill. Since there is, as of today, still no foreign assistance authorization, it is not within the rules to report the bill. This is also true of the supplemental bill, especially in regard to the poverty program.

There is no better process that I know of than to have these appropriation bills considered by the committee in the House and then on the floor of the House; by the committee in the Senate and then on the floor of the Senate; and then to resolve any differences in conference.

General provisions designed to effect economies by blind, overall, across-the-board reductions are bound to be inequitable, inefficient, and it is impossible to access their results at the time they are being considered.

According to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in one agency alone—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the provision adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives would result in an appropriation reduction of \$2½ billion. This figure was calculated by the Bureau of the Budget because the provision in the resolution would cut \$1.1 billion in expenditures in fiscal year 1968.

To reduce \$1.1 billion in expenditures in a single fiscal year would mean a much larger reduction in obligations, grants, or contracts, and it is estimated that to secure \$1.1 billion in expenditure reductions would require about \$2 to \$2½ billion reductions in obligations—a cut from \$2 to \$2½ billion—a cut ranging from 28 to 33 percent. I cannot believe that the House of Representatives was aware of this at the time the provision was voted.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development would be required to make a \$500 million expenditure reduction and such a reduction would require a very large proportionate cut in new contracts, mortgage purchases, sewer, water, and open space programs, and the like, because, again, to get a \$500 million expenditure reduction, one would have to make a much larger reduction in commitments and contracts.

For the farm programs under the Department of Agriculture, a \$400 million reduction in expenditures would be required.

The committee was also advised that many agencies would be required to introduce reductions in force. These reductions would have to be concentrated in the last 7 months of the fiscal year because one-third of the fiscal year has expired. Severance pay and terminal leave would have to be taken into consideration, as well as 30 days' advance notice to affected employees—which would mean that in some agencies personnel to the extent of perhaps 20 percent would be removed from the payrolls.

I do not believe there was any such intention on the part of the House of Representatives in passing the resolution referred to.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget estimated that the reductions in expenditures in fiscal year 1968, under the resolution as it passed the House, would amount to approximately \$7 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record a list of the agencies where the approximately \$7 billion will be found.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:



House Joint Resolution 888—Estimated reduction effected by resolution as passed House

	1968 expenditures
Defense .....	\$2,500,000,000
Health, Education, and Welfare .....	1,100,000,000
Agriculture .....	400,000,000
Commerce .....	250,000,000
Housing and Urban Development .....	500,000,000
Public Works .....	40,000,000
Interior .....	150,000,000
Justice .....	45,000,000
Labor .....	20,000,000
State .....	10,000,000
Transportation .....	75,000,000
Agency for International Development .....	140,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission .....	120,000,000
General Services Administration .....	30,000,000
Office of Economic Opportunity .....	400,000,000
Veterans' Administration .....	180,000,000
Pay Raise .....	600,000,000
Small Business Administration .....	200,000,000
National Science Foundation .....	60,000,000
Total .....	6,821,000,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if it is necessary to reduce expenditures at this time, before the Congress adjourns, I recommend that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses undertake an examination of the bills which have been signed into law, and the bills which will be sent to the White House soon—and if the amounts are found to be excessive that a rescission bill be considered in the two Houses.

Any attempt to effect economies by a blind, across-the-board general provision is impracticable.

I urge that the committee amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "November 23, 1967" and insert "November 15, 1967":

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting House Joint Resolution 888 as strictly a continuing resolution until November 15 represents a clear declaration that Congress, not the executive branch, still wields the power of the purse. The appropriations process is the tried and true method by which Congress exercises this power. This continuing resolution will enable all of the Federal Departments and agencies to pay their bills for the next three weeks. In

the meantime, the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to consider deliberately each authorized program contained in the remaining appropriation bills. It will scrutinize each dollar contained in the budget estimates for those agencies. It will use to the fullest the collective experience and judgment of its members to cut out every ounce of fat, to scrap every nonessential. This is the way to effect savings, with rational, informed judgment.

The House-passed resolution, on the other hand, substitutes a meat ax for the finely honed scalpel, abdicates the traditional right and duty of the Congress to consider each and every appropriation request on its merits, deals a crippling blow to many vital Federal programs.

Why a crippling blow? On the surface, holding spending to the 1967 level, with certain exceptions, does not seem too bad. But let us look further. The effect of the House resolution is to cut about \$7 billion from 1968 spending. But since expenditures always lag behind appropriations, and since the fiscal year is already nearly one-third over, this \$7 billion cut in expenditures would mean a \$14 or \$15 billion reduction in obligations—the best measure of the level of Federal programs in a particular time period.

That is not all. As the Budget Director spelled out in detail for the Appropriations Committee, this \$14 or \$15 billion reduction must come largely from that relatively thin slice of the Federal budget which is not already locked in. When national defense, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions, price support payments, and other obligations fixed by law are taken out, \$38 billion is left from which to cut. Taking \$14 or \$15 billion away from this \$38 billion amounts to cutting almost 40 percent from every single controllable program. The Budget Director listed 75 of these programs for us, and that was not a complete list. The list ran all the way from grants for educational activities to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The House-passed resolution would wreck many of our most vital programs. It has wisely been rejected by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

My very good friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has stated his intention to call up an amendment to the continuing resolution in the Senate today. His amendment would reduce, by 5 percent, every appropriation item not related to national defense, except for those determined by the Budget Director to be beyond administrative control. The amendment would also give the President blanket authority to transfer money around among the agencies so long as no line-item appropriation was increased above the amount provided in the Appropriation Act.

To be sure, the Mundt amendment is an improvement over the House-passed resolution. The Mundt amendment would cut about \$1 billion in expenditures in the fiscal year 1968 instead of \$7 billion, as would be provided by the House-passed resolution. But the real price of this \$1 billion in savings is very high. A vote for the Mundt amendment

is a vote for the meat axe approach—even though the axe has a smaller blade; a vote for the principle that the President and the Budget Director—not Congress—should wield the power of the purse in the U.S. Government; a vote against the combined wisdom and judgment of the members of the Appropriations Committee. In effect, the amendment says, "No matter what recommendations you make to the Senate on appropriations bills, you are 5 percent wrong."

We cannot even foresee the impact of this amendment. The President is not allowed to increase any appropriation above the amount we include in the law, but he can surely reduce some of them by much more than 5 percent, by 10 percent, or even by 100 percent, if he so wishes.

For example: Suppose he determines that aviation safety activities cannot be cut without endangering airline passengers. He can take it out of the school lunch program instead; suppose he determines that the Internal Revenue Service and the Customs Bureau cannot be cut without losing a much greater amount of Federal revenues. He can take it out of impacted area school aid instead; suppose he determines that veterans' medical programs cannot be cut without decreasing the quality of patient care. He can take it out of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation instead; suppose he determines that the Post Office cannot be cut without delaying the mail. He can take it out of the food stamp program or the FBI instead.

Can we really stand here today and say to the American people: "The Senate of the United States hereby declares that it wants no part in making these decisions—decisions affecting every citizen"? I do not think so. I feel that it is our responsibility to determine where the cuts should be made and that we should not, in the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], put the cat on the President's back.

And what does this amendment say to the members of the Committee on Appropriations? Does it say: "Now, you gentlemen are to go back and deliberate for the next 3 weeks on the remaining appropriations bills. You are to bring to bear the wisdom and informed judgment which you have acquired over the years. And when you're all done and have made a decision on each line item, you're to add 5 percent to every one, so that when it's taken back out again by the President, your judgment will be vindicated."

No one in this body is more interested in economy and efficiency in Government than I am. I have the utmost respect and sympathy for the sentiments which prompted this amendment. But I submit that the way to make savings in the budget is not to flail away with a meat ax—with results that no Senator in this body can even venture to predict. The way to save money is by using the tried and true appropriations process.

So, I hope that Senators will vote down this amendment, and any other similar amendments. Let us vote for a

straight, clean, continuing resolution until November 15. During the next 3 weeks, let Congress work its will, let the Senate Appropriations Committee work its will on the remaining appropriation bills, saving every penny where we can justifiably and wisely save pennies.

Let it not be said that today, or tomorrow—whichever it may be—the Senate passed the buck, or that the Senate voted away its birthright—the cherished power of the purse.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that I am in thorough agreement with what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has just said. I may add that this morning we were in conference on the public works bill and the Senate saw fit to cut back a little over 10 percent on all the projects by way of slippages. Now, to add another 5 percent, there is no doubt that the work now in progress on all the dams and rivers and harbors programs would suffer considerably.

I would much prefer leaving this in the hands of the Congress than to let somebody in the departments do the cutting. What that amounts to, in reality, is granting to the Executive the right to the item veto. Congress has always refused to grant this authority, and with very good reason. No other single act would transfer to the Executive so much additional power at one fell swoop.

The continuing resolution sent to the Senate by the House was very difficult of interpretation, to say the least. No one could predict what effect its provisions would have on the workings of our Government. In large part, this was because the difficult decisions were transferred from the legislative branch to the executive.

Another effect of the resolution was to wipe away all the work already performed by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. In effect, its adoption would make unnecessary all of the work that must yet be done on the bills still remaining. Perhaps others are willing to see this slate wiped clean so that the blanks can be filled in by the clerks of the executive branch. I, for one, am not.

The responsibility lies with the Congress and its committees. Reductions should be recommended by the committees on a selective basis, as has already been the case with every appropriations bill to pass the Congress this year. To attempt to lodge this responsibility anywhere else would be to allow and invite an infringement on the prerogative of Congress.

In my view, too much infringement of these prerogatives has already taken place.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his very helpful statement. I want to congratulate him, as chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, for the very fine work he does, consistently, every year, year in and year out, scrutinizing most meticulously the budget requests and the requests submitted to his committee by Members of this body, the other

body, and outside witnesses. He does a fine job, as do all the other members who work with him in that committee. He has done a fine job this year in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the first committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10442. An act to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U. S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 10442. An act to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA AT DEDICATION OF LEETOWN, W. VA., FISH HATCHERY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on last Saturday I delivered an address at the ceremony marking the opening of the Leetown, W. Va., Fish Hatchery.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my address on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, AT THE LEETOWN FISH HATCHERY

My friends, it is always a pleasure to take part in the dedication of a new federal facility.

And this particular dedication gives me great pleasure because this complex of facilities is more than just a place where fish are hatched and reared.

Rather, it is a complex which represents the latest advances in the field of fish husbandry.

It combines well planned production facilities with an internationally respected research center.

But before I go into further detail about this particular center I should like to present a little bit of background about our national fish hatchery system and its importance.

Since its inception in the late 19th century our fish hatchery system has increased in numbers, in productive capacity and in the quality of fish grown.

Today there are some 100 federal fish hatcheries which are supplemented by about 500 state-run hatcheries.

There has been a greatly increased interest in all types of outdoor recreation during the years since World War II and fishing—along with all other outdoor sports—has burgeoned apace.

The recent National Survey of Fishing and Hunting gives us some indication of the size of this increase. It states that some 33 million Americans participated in these sports during 1965 and, in so doing, spent some \$4 billion.

Without the help of our federal and state hatcheries, mother nature would be hard pressed to meet the need for more and more fish.

As an example of the tremendous growth of sport fishing in recent years, let me cite as an example the experience of our own state of West Virginia.

West Virginia's waters are stocked with fish produced both naturally and from State and Federal Hatcheries. Almost 450,000 pounds of fish, mostly trout, were planted by state and federal officials.

About half of these fish—225,000 pounds—were produced right here at Leetown, at the Bowden Hatchery near Elkins, and at the White Sulphur Springs Hatchery in Greenbrier County.

And great though this volume of fish may seem, the federal allocation of fish for West Virginia waters is three times greater today than it was four years ago in 1963.

So, as one can see, these hatcheries play a tremendous role in keeping our state's anglers happy and their catches bountiful.

Now, I would like to tell you a little more about this particular hatchery. It is a fine one indeed.

If you look into the water in the raceways, you will be able to see a number of species of trout. And near where we are standing, there are a number of large ponds that produce other fish such as bass and sunfish.

These fish are grown in the newly constructed hatchery building. This structure incorporates all the latest developments in fish husbandry, and its staff is able to produce the highest quality fish under the most carefully controlled conditions.

The fish begin life as eggs, spawned in other hatcheries which maintain specially selected brood fish. These eggs are placed in special tanks until they hatch into tiny, helpless, near invisible, fry.

These small fish are then carefully nurtured. They are fed a nutritionally balanced diet, and when they are large enough to live outside, they are moved to one of the large raceways for further growth.

When they have reached a sufficient age



and size best suited to survive in the wild, they are released into the state's streams and lakes.

From there, well, that's up to the anglers to determine—whether these fish become a fish dinner or, instead, perhaps the dinner of some other fish.

But the Leetown Hatchery does more than just to produce and rear fish. Its internationally known Eastern Fish Disease Laboratory has provided much of the information available to scientists on fish diseases.

Experts in the diagnosis and treatment of the illnesses that plague fish have been trained here for service throughout the U.S. and the world.

As an example of its work, last July the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife proposed a new regulation designed to prevent the importation and spread of two particularly dangerous trout diseases. Although the initial responsibility for examining these fish will reside in the country of origin, we must have facilities and people to run spot checks to see that the regulation is enforced.

As a further example of its work, many states will soon enact regulations requiring inspection and certification of interstate transfers of fish or fish eggs. The Federal Government must be prepared to assist the Bureau in performing this vital function. Personnel here at Leetown will probably be called upon to play a major role in this regard.

Other activities are also carried on at the Laboratory. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife uses this hatchery as a base of operations for a number of its in-service training schools where Bureau employees, persons from state conservation agencies, and personnel of foreign governments can be trained in modern fish growing methods.

This is important because sport fishing in West Virginia and across the nation is not only fun; it is also big business. According to the National Fishing and Hunting Survey I mentioned earlier some \$4 billion was spent in the pursuit of these sports. This money generally goes to those areas where good fishing, or good hunting, is found.

In the days ahead, even more fishermen will be participating in this great outdoor pursuit, and, as their numbers increase, our waters must of necessity, be managed to provide the necessary fish.

I am sure that our National Hatchery system in general, and the Leetown Fish Hatchery in particular, will do their part to see that these demands are met.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for

the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment has not been agreed to yet.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the committee amendment been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been acted upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know of no debate on the committee amendment that would change the date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to changing the date but I would like to make a brief statement first in connection with the entire problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

#### THE CHAOTIC FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, two major problems confront our country: First, the war in Vietnam; and, second, the mounting deficit and the resulting inflation, as evidenced by the rising cost of living and the highest interest rates since Reconstruction days in 1870.

So much has been said about the first problem, the war in Vietnam, by the various experts that I know of nothing I can add which would help the situation. I shall therefore pass over this subject with just one comment: With a half million men in the war zone, we have no choice except to back them with all our resources, and as one Member of the Senate, I shall continue to give them that support.

Today I shall confine my remarks to a discussion of the chaotic financial situa-

tion in which we find ourselves. I refer to our fiscal situation as being nearly chaotic because never before in the history of our country has there been so much confusion both at the executive and at the legislative levels as to what is happening or what should be done.

For the past several months, both the White House and Congress have been advocating a reduction in Government spending; but both the executive and the legislative branches have been approving new programs, expanding old ones, and voting for ever-increased expenditures. And yet no one has faced up to the problem of what this will mean in ultimate inflation and higher taxes.

First I shall review the spending record of the Senate.

Since January 1, 1967, the Senate has acted on 13 appropriation bills.

As passed by the House these appropriation bills call for total appropriations of \$134,881,670,839. As passed by the Senate these same bills contained appropriations totaling \$138,936,819,459, or an increase of \$4,055,148,620 over that originally approved by the House.

These same 13 appropriation bills contained appropriations of \$3,175,648,998 over the amount allowed for the same agencies in fiscal 1967.

During the consideration of these bills 21 efforts were made to reduce these appropriations. Every effort to reduce them was defeated on rollcall votes in the Senate.

Had these 21 efforts been successful they would have resulted in lowering the overall appropriations under these 30 bills by \$4,467,177,919.

It is true that some items had been reduced by the Senate committee before reporting the bills to the Senate, but it is ironic to note that the only amendments to any of these appropriation bills which were approved by the Senate were amendments which added to the cost of the bills.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a chart of these appropriation bills along with the amount of each as it passed the House, the amount as it passed the Senate, and the corresponding increases or decreases as compared to the 1967 appropriations.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### 1968 APPROPRIATIONS

Date	Bill	Amount in House	Amount in Senate	Senate increase (+) or decrease (—) over House	Amount 1967 appropriation, increase (+) or decrease (—)
Mar. 17	H.R. 7123, supplemental Defense	\$12,196,520,000	\$12,275,870,000	+\$79,350,000	
May 19	H.R. 7501, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office	7,499,230,000	7,555,167,000	+\$55,937,000	+\$459,108,865
May 16	H.R. 9029, Interior	1,365,310,150	1,399,242,050	+\$33,931,900	+\$66,083,250
May 17	H.R. 9481, 2d supplemental	2,041,826,133	2,260,246,933	+\$218,420,800	
Aug. 29	H.R. 9960, Independent Offices and HUD (Part. cert.)	9,985,878,782	10,431,460,900	+\$445,582,118	+\$880,461,600
Aug. 1	H.R. 10196, Labor and HEW	881,000,000	3,235,000,000	+\$2,354,000,000	+\$1,555,000,000
Sept. 26	H.R. 10345, State, Justice, Commerce (Part. cert.)	13,137,488,000	13,409,835,000	+\$272,347,000	+\$393,270,800
June 29	H.R. 10368, Legislative branch	2,194,026,500	2,185,870,500	-\$8,156,000	+\$52,782,300
July 11	H.R. 10509, Agriculture (Part. sales)	150,000,000	150,000,000		-\$70,000,000
Aug. 4	H.R. 10738, Defense	228,089,952	273,662,404	+\$45,572,452	+\$3,159,461
Sept. 28	H.R. 11456, Transportation	13,370,580,950	13,797,673,400	+\$427,092,450	+\$332,101,950
Oct. 3	H.R. 11641, Public works and Atomic Energy	800,000,000	700,000,000	-\$100,000,000	+\$100,000,000
		70,295,200,000	70,156,420,000	-\$138,780,000	-\$73,202,000
		1,530,198,372	1,651,407,272	+\$121,208,900	+\$69,910,228
		4,622,922,000	4,776,064,000	+\$153,142,000	+\$465,893,000
		4,583,400,000	4,678,900,000	+\$95,500,000	-\$289,100,000
Total		134,881,670,839	138,936,819,459	+\$4,055,148,620	+\$3,175,648,998

\*Restoration of capital by CCC not included.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, following this, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a statistical breakdown of the numerous amendments, including dates, vote numbers,

and so forth, which dealt with efforts to reduce the amount of these appropriations. This list does not include amendments offered to authorization bills. There being no objection, the tabula-

tion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

# RECORD VOTES ON REDUCTIONS IN 1968 APPROPRIATIONS

	Vote No.	Date, 1967	Vote	Amount of reduction or increase		Vote No.	Date, 1967	Vote	Amount of reduction or increase
H.R. 10509, Agriculture (Williams), limit subsidy payments to \$10,000.	129	July 13	14-76	\$329,174,519	H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase model cities funds.	194	Sept. 20	62-28	\$300,000,000
H.R. 10509, Agriculture (Williams), reduce from \$220,000,000 to \$120,000,000 new ACP authority.	130	do.	10-82	100,000,000	H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Harris), increase funds for National Science Foundation.	197	do.	63-25	46,000,000
H.R. 10196, Labor-HEW (Williams motion), recommit bill to reduce 5 percent.	144	Aug. 2	19-64	675,000,000	H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase authorization for sale of HUD part. cert.	198	Sept. 21	57-30	1,804,000,000
H.R. 10738, Defense (Kennedy, Massachusetts), reduce from \$482,000 to \$200,000 rifle practice funds.	170	Aug. 22	23-67	228,000	H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase funds for HUD part. cert. insufficiencies.	199	do.	54-32	19,115,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Young, Ohio), reduce civil defense funds by \$20,000,000.	188	Sept. 19	32-55	20,000,000	H.R. 11456, Transportation (Proxmire), reduce super-sonic transport funds.	283	Oct. 5	19-54	141,375,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (Williams), cut public building construction funds by \$21,036,200.	189	do.	27-57	21,036,200	H.R. 11456, Transportation (Williams), reduce FAA equipment funds.	284	do.	2-68	37,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase funds for Federal office building construction.	191	do.	63-23	16,130,000	H.R. 12474, NASA (Proxmire-Williams), reduce funds for several programs.	286	Oct. 6	30-36	100,500,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase authorization for sale of VA part. cert.	192	do.	56-31	550,000,000	H.R. 12474, NASA (Williams), reduce funds for Voyager program.	287	do.	31-34	26,000,000
H.R. 9960, independent offices and HUD (committee), increase grants for neighborhood facilities.	193	do.	60-23	15,000,000	H.R. 11641, public works (Williams motion), recommit to cut funds.	289	Oct. 9	12-61	18,516,000
					H.R. 10345, State, Justice (Williams), eliminate SACB funds.	290	Oct. 10	27-54	247,808,200
						295	Oct. 11	37-54	295,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the above chart shows the overwhelming margin by which these efforts to reduce appropriations were rejected. An argument can be made that the particular amendments referred to in this report were not the best way in which to achieve reductions in expenditures; however, in answer to that argument I point out that these were the only efforts made to reduce these appropriations and therefore we can proceed on the assumption that at least no one in the Senate knew of a better plan or procedure.

I mention this record, which shows that the Senate has consistently increased the appropriations above those originally approved by the House, to illustrate that we in the Senate cannot dodge our responsibility for the ever-expanding deficits which are now confronting our Government.

However, lest there be any misunderstanding that I am placing the sole responsibility for this high rate of spending on the Senate, I point out that the White House had the veto power to stop these expenditures and did not use it. The President and his political party have control of both the House and the Senate. Almost daily the White House has been sending to the Congress its recommendations for new programs and for increased expenditures under old programs, and until the last few weeks the White House has displayed very little, if any, concern for the tremendous deficits it has consistently piled up for the past 5 years. Not only has the administration been encouraging the expansion of these new spending schemes which were initiated by its Great Society bureaucracy, but the White House has consistently been urging substantially increased expenditures on its own initiative.

For example, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 12080, the bill which provided over \$3 billion in additional annual benefits to those living on social security and welfare. Within a few hours after House approval of this bill the administration's representative, Secre-

tary Gardner, was denouncing it as inadequate, and when he testified before the Senate Finance Committee he presented the administration's recommendation asking that \$3¼ billion more be added to the House-passed bill.

To pay for the \$3¼ billion additional benefits the administration recommended a social security tax increase of only \$200 million during the calendar year 1968. Under the President's plan the increased taxes necessary to finance these additional benefits costing \$3¼ billion would not become effective until January 1, 1969, or 60 days after the 1968 presidential election.

Furthermore, the administration also recommends that at least one-half of the increased taxes necessary to pay for the \$3 billion benefits under the House-passed bill likewise be postponed until after the 1968 election.

Thus we have a situation where now the Johnson administration is recommending a social security bill which would pump over \$6 billion extra cash into the economy in calendar year 1968 with only \$1.3 billion of this amount being raised in revenue during this same calendar year. Under the administration's plan, payroll taxes to pay for the other \$5 billion will not be effective until after the 1968 election.

How can the administration possibly reconcile these contradicting positions wherein on one hand it testifies before the Finance Committee in favor of a bill which will pump an additional \$5 billion in spending money into the economy during 1968 and then 2 weeks later recommend to the same committee a 10-percent across-the-board increase, one of the stated purposes of which is to combat inflation by siphoning from the economy \$7 billion of what is described as excess spending power?

It is this type of contradiction by the Johnson administration which has created so much confusion not only in the minds of the Members of Congress but also in the minds of the American people in general, and it is this type of contradiction or zig-zagging which has brought

our country to the verge of disastrous inflation.

Now for a moment let us discuss this Johnson inflation and examine the results as it affects millions of wage earners and retired citizens.

Wages for the factory workers are rising, yes; but the cost of living is rising equally as fast with the result that the wage earners—Government employees, factory workers, farmers, small businessmen, and so forth—are on the treadmill. Ask any American housewife, and she will tell you about the cost of groceries. She understands what this inflation means.

History shows that the real victims of inflation are always the low- and middle-income groups with the highest penalties being paid by the retirees—those living on fixed pensions.

Today's inflation is the direct result of the Johnson administration's policy of planned deficits.

Today's inflation and today's staggering budget deficit are the direct result of the reckless spending policies of the Johnson administration and its 4-year insistence that we can finance a large-scale war in Vietnam without any sacrifice on the home front.

Today we are reaping the whirlwind of inflation as the result of the seeds of bad fiscal management under the Johnson administration.

To comply with the administration's request to increase taxes only to provide additional revenue to finance the extravagant ideas of the Great Society bureaucrats would only make the situation worse.

To combat inflation effectively a reduction of expenditures must precede action on taxes, and lest there be any misunderstanding I am not interested in promises of reductions either at the congressional or at the executive level. Past experience shows that these expenditure reductions must be made mandatory by law. We are about to go broke on speeches and promises of economy which far too often in the past have been followed by increased expenditures.

However, in view of the size of the



deficits which have been accumulating over the past several years and particularly in view of the staggering deficit which confronts us for fiscal 1968, I am not sure we can bring this situation under control entirely through the reduction of expenditures. It may very well take a tax increase as well as a bona fide reduction in expenditures to control this serious inflationary trend with which we are now confronted. While I am not endorsing a tax increase as the solution I will state that as far as I am concerned the solvency of this country is paramount, and if after a bona fide reduction in expenditures has been achieved it appears that a tax increase would still be necessary I would support it. I would support it on the same basis and for the same reason that I opposed the administration's \$2 billion tax reduction which was pushed through the Congress last March.

I am far more concerned over the disastrous results of a continuation of this inflationary trend than I am over the political consequences of a tax increase. My criticism of the Johnson administration has been and will continue to be that under its reckless spending policies, disguised as planned deficits and so-called controlled inflation, it has allowed our country to drift toward this financial crisis.

Millions of our retired citizens, who are living on fixed incomes, social security, Government and private pensions, life insurance policies, savings accounts, and so forth, have been pauperized as a result of this deliberately planned Johnson inflation represented by the increased cost of living, or the diminishing purchasing power of the dollar.

Thousands of these citizens have retired on what they thought was adequate to take care of their needs, yet they are now being forced to apply for public welfare to meet necessary living expenses.

This administration keeps repeating its great concern over the millions of poverty-stricken people in America. Why should it not be concerned? It is the inflationary policies of the Johnson administration which are responsible for a lot of those people being in poverty today.

It is the inflationary policies of the Johnson administration which have created the highest interest rates in the 20th century.

During the Eisenhower administration, when interest rates rose from 3½ percent to between 4 and 4¼ percent, Democratic Members of the Senate almost daily were denouncing the administration on what they referred to as high interest policies. The leaders of that daily brigade of speakers were the then Senators Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Today with interest rates at the highest level in the past 100 years, and 50 percent higher than the peak levels of the Eisenhower administration, both President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY are strangely silent. Significantly, not an echo of concern can be heard from the other side of the Senate Chamber.

Why? Why are they so strangely silent? Is it that the members of this Great Society are ashamed of their achievements of forcing on the American public the highest interest rates since the post-Civil War days, or is it because they just hope that the people will forget and that maybe this problem will solve itself and vanish?

But the solution is not that easy. Congress and the executive branch are both confronted with some hard political decisions—decisions which cannot be postponed much longer.

Interest rates today are at a historic 100-year high.

Interest charges on our huge national debt in fiscal 1968 will be in excess of \$14 billion.

This compares with annual interest charges of \$9.8 billion when President Johnson took office in January 1964—an increase of over \$4 billion in interest charges on our national debt in just 4 years, with approximately one-half of this extra \$4 billion representing the interest charges on the money borrowed to finance the deficits that have been created under the Johnson administration in this same period.

President Johnson, while serving as the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, was a strong and almost daily critic of what he described as the high interest policies of the Eisenhower administration, yet under his administration interest rates have increased by over 50 percent and the interest charges on our national debt have increased by \$4 billion, or over 40 percent.

Today AAA industrial bonds are selling

to yield in excess of 6 percent annual interest, while U.S. Government bonds are selling at prices which yield in excess of 5½ percent interest.

The only money which the U.S. Government today is borrowing at less than 4¼ percent interest is the money it is borrowing from the workers of America through the sale of series E bonds.

I quote President Johnson's remarks of June 14, 1957, at which time he was a Member of the Senate:

This administration has managed to perform an impossible task. While the value of the dollar has gone down and down for those who spend it, it has gone up and up for those who lend it....

We cannot exist indefinitely as a Nation in which the most profitable activity is lending.

I most respectfully suggest that the President should read his speech on that particular date.

Were these remarks a prophecy? Interest rates in 1957 were 50 percent lower than today's high level. To show just how rapidly interest rates have advanced under the Johnson administration I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table as appearing in the September 1967 "Treasury Bulletin" which shows the average yields on Treasury bonds for each of the years beginning with 1957 and extending through September 1967.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Period:	Treasury bonds	
1957	.....	3.47
1958	.....	3.43
1959	.....	4.08
1960	.....	4.02
1961	.....	3.90
1962	.....	3.95
1963	.....	4.00
1964	.....	4.15
1965	.....	4.21
1966	.....	4.65
1967 September	.....	4.95

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, following that, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report as appearing in the Wall Street Journal of October 20, 1967, which shows today's price and yield of U.S. Government bonds and notes.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES, OCT. 19, 1967

##### TREASURY BONDS

[Over-the-Counter Quotations: Source on request. Decimals in bid-and-asked and bid change represent 32ds (101.1 means 101 1/32), a-Plus 1/64, b-Yield to call date, c-Certificates of indebtedness, d-Minus 1/64]

Interest rate	Maturity		Bid	Asked	Bid change	Yield	Interest rate	Maturity		Bid	Asked	Bid change	Yield
	Year	Month						Year	Month				
3½	1967	November	99.31	100.1	(a)	3.08	2½	1967-72	September	88.26	89.2	+2	5.04
3½	1968	May	99.7	99.9		5.19	2½	1967-72	December	88.4	88.12		5.10
3½	1968	August	98.23	98.25		5.30	4	1973	August	92.6	92.14	+2	5.54
3½	1968	November	98.15	98.17	-0.1	5.31	4½	1973	November	92.16	92.24	+2	5.55
2½	1963-68	December	97.4	97.8		5.00	4½	1974	February	92.6	92.14	+2	5.56
4	1969	February	98.8	98.12		5.30	4½	1974	May	92.28	93.4	+2	5.51
2½	1964-69	June	95.23	95.27	-1	5.17	3½	1974	November	90.14	90.22	+2	5.48
4	1969	October	97.10	97.14		5.41	4	1980	February	86.8	86.24	-4	5.49
2½	1964-69	December	94.17	94.21	-1	5.16	3½	1980	November	81.16	82.0	-12	5.44
2½	1965-70	March	94.4	94.8		5.08	3½	1978-83	June	77.0	77.16	-26	5.40
4	1970	February	96.21	96.25		5.51	3½	1985	May	76.24	77.8	-18	5.15
4	1970	August	96.1	96.5	-1	5.49	4½	1975-85	May	86.18	87.2	-8	5.40
2½	1966-71	March	91.23	91.27		5.15	3½	1990	February	76.22	77.6	-10	5.24
4	1971	August	94.23	94.27	+1	5.52	4½	1987-92	August	83.22	84.6	-2	5.41
3½	1971	November	94.0	94.4	+1	5.51	4	1988-93	February	81.12	81.28	-6	5.32
4	1972	February	93.2	93.6	+2	5.53	4½	1989-94	May	81.14	81.30	-6	5.41
2½	1967-72	June	89.10	89.18	+2	5.05	3	1995	February	76.2	76.18		4.50
4	1972	August	93.20	93.78	+2	5.46	3½	1998	November	76.12	76.28	-8	4.97

GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES, OCT. 19, 1967—Continued

## U.S. TREASURY NOTES

Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield	Rate	Maturity	Bid	Asked	Yield
4½	November 1967	100.1	100.3	3.30	5	November 1970	98.16	98.20	5.50
5½	February 1968	100.6	100.8	4.16	5½	February 1971	99.16	99.18	5.52
1½	April 1968	98.16	98.22	4.53	1½	April 1971	89.20	89.30	4.70
4½	May 1968	99.23	99.25	5.15	5½	May 1971	99.8	99.12	5.45
4½	August 1968	99.4	99.6	5.28	1½	October 1971	88.8	88.24	4.66
1½	October 1968	97.6	97.10	4.45	5½	November 1971	99.17	99.21	5.47
5½	November 1968	99.25	99.27	5.40	4½	February 1972	96.25	96.29	5.57
1½	April 1969	95.10	95.18	4.72	1½	April 1972	86.26	87.26	4.56
1½	October 1969	93.28	94.4	4.70	4½	May 1972	96.22	96.26	5.55
1½	April 1970	92.14	92.19	4.75	1½	October 1972	85.10	86.12	4.62
1½	October 1970	91.2	91.18	4.60					

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, next, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing how the total interest costs of our national debt has practically doubled between the fiscal years 1957 and 1968.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Total interest cost

1957	\$7,244,000,000
1958	7,607,000,000
1959	7,593,000,000
1960	9,180,000,000
1961	8,957,000,000
1962	9,120,000,000
1963	9,895,000,000
1964	10,666,000,000
1965	11,346,000,000
1966	12,014,000,000
1967	13,391,000,000
1968 (estimated)	14,050,000,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, where are all those self-proclaimed authorities on monetary policies who during the Eisenhower administration almost daily proclaimed their grave concern over interest rates which at that time were 50 percent lower than today's level?

For years the Johnson administration has been telling the American people that our country can afford both guns and butter. It still insists that all of the Great Society programs can be financed and expanded while at the same time we finance a full-scale war in Vietnam.

The free-wheeling spenders of this Great Society in Congress echo the same tune and then attempt to justify their positions on the false premise that if a tax increase must be enacted it would be placed on the rich and wealthy rather than on the low- and middle-income groups. Such arguments are pure political hypocrisy.

To answer that fallacious argument, I had the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation compile a tabulation which shows just how fictitious that claim is. For example, if we were to enact—

A 100-percent tax—that is, complete confiscation—on all incomes in America in excess of \$50,000—\$100,000 joint return—it would provide but \$700 million in additional revenue.

A 100-percent tax on all personal incomes in excess of \$25,000—\$50,000 joint return—that is, confiscation of all incomes in excess of \$25,000—would provide but \$2.1 billion in additional revenue, or just about enough to offset the current deficit of the Johnson administration for 1 month.

A 100-percent tax on all income in excess of \$10,000—\$20,000 joint return—

would provide but \$13.2 billion in additional revenue, or not even enough to balance our budget in fiscal 1968 assuming there would be no reduction in expenditures.

Even these estimates of tax revenue are based on the false assumption that all of those earning in excess of the amounts referred to will continue to work just as hard as they now do for the sole purpose of turning it all over to Uncle Sam.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 29, 1967, signed by Mr. Laurence M. Woodworth, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, wherein these figures are confirmed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL  
REVENUE TAXATION,  
Washington, September 29, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reference to your request of this morning (by telephone through Mr. Vall) for an estimate of the revenue gain which would result from taxing at 100% all taxable income over \$10,000 (\$20,000 for joint returns), over \$25,000 (\$50,000 for joint returns), over \$50,000 (\$100,000 for joint returns), and over \$100,000 (\$200,000 for joint returns), respectively.

At estimated 1967 levels of income, we estimate the revenue gain to be as follows:

If taxable income were taxed at 100 percent—	The revenue gain would be—
Over \$10,000	\$13.2 billion.
Over \$25,000	2.1 billion.
Over \$50,000	0.7 billion.
Over \$100,000	0.2 billion.
Capital gains subject to alternative tax.	1.9 billion.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call these statistics to the attention of the Senate and the country to emphasize the fact that as Congress increases its spending it will be the low- and middle-income groups who pay the tax.

I regret the necessity for taking this much time of the Senate to make this report, but in my opinion, second only to our problems with the war in Vietnam, the fiscal policies of this country are of paramount importance.

For too long both the administration and the Congress have been following a drifting policy with the result that our balance of payments has been getting

worse. Our supply of gold has dropped from \$17.804 million in 1961 to \$13.075 million today. Our national debt today stands at \$340 billion, an alltime high. Our expenditures for the past 5 years have been exceeding our national income by an average of over \$10 billion per year, and today our deficit is running at a substantially higher rate.

As a result of the artificial ceiling of 4½ percent on longtime Government bonds, a farcical situation which is being perpetrated upon the insistence of the Johnson administration, our Government for the past several years has been unable to sell any bonds with maturity in excess of 7 years, until 1967, this was 5 years. The result is that we have been financing our deficits on short-term basis, or in effect monetizing our national debt.

It is ironic to note that the only money which the Federal Government is borrowing today at 4½-percent interest rates is by virtue of the series E bonds which it is selling to the American workman and the schoolchild. I say it is ironic because this discrimination among lenders is being practiced by an administration which is always speaking so much about its concern over the little investor; yet today, when regular Government bonds with 7-year maturity, are selling at yields in excess of 5½ percent, the Johnson administration insists that the small investor should not be paid over 4½ percent.

I know of no better way to express my opinion on this practice of the Johnson administration's discrimination against the small investor who buys these series E bonds than to quote the words of the Vice President of the United States, Mr. HUMPHREY, who, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, when discussing this same point on June 1, 1959, said:

When one sifts through all the arguments of the administration as to the virtues of tight money and soaring interest rates, he really gets down to the fundamental fact that the administration simply believes it is all right for the bankers to boost their prices and reap a harvest, but that somehow it is not quite proper for wage earners to ask to share in the increased productivity of the economy. What the administration actually believes in is the old trickle-down system, whereby the main course goes to the high and the mighty, and the leftovers to John Q. Public.

If the administration really wants to do something about the cost of living, I suggest that it stop and re-examine its position on monetary policy.

There is nothing which I can add which would state more eloquently the situation as it exists under the Johnson



administration today than to quote the Vice President.

These high interest rates have been especially harsh on the home buyers of America, the farmers, and the small businessmen who could not pass on these excessive charges as part of the cost of a Government contract.

Today nearly 50 percent of our \$340 billion debt has a maturity of less than 1 year as compared with only 38 percent for a similar maturity in 1960 and 32 percent in 1955.

Such a trend automatically reduces the percentage of our national debt which is financed with bonds with maturity dates in excess of 5 years.

Our deficit situation is serious, and this inflationary trend cannot and must not be ignored any longer.

The continuing uncertainty as to whether the President is sincere or not sincere in his request for a tax increase and the uncertainty as to whether Congress will or will not comply with his request for the enactment of a tax increase is creating a state of confusion in our financial and business world.

For Congress to adjourn and go home without having answered this question of whether a tax increase will be enacted or to postpone this decision until the first of next year will only further add to this state of confusion.

The American dollar is not in a position secure enough whereby either the Congress or the administration can afford to dillydally. The day of decision is here. Flowery speeches and more promises are not enough. This is the time for action.

The American people are entitled to the truth as to the precarious financial situation with which we are confronted.

In the past too much has been said in an effort to play down the real size of our deficit spending.

One of the major reasons the President is having such difficulty in selling his tax program to Congress and to the American people is largely due to the fact that they do not trust his estimates of deficits, nor do they trust his promises of economy.

In fact, ever since last January, when the President first asked for a 6-percent tax increase, questions have been asked: Is he sincere, or is this just another political maneuver to give the President an image of fiscal responsibility?

This question of the President's sincerity in recommending a tax increase was accentuated by comments of the Nation's top business leaders who met at Hot Springs, Va., just last week. I quote from press accounts of this meeting as appearing in the Evening Star of October 20, 1967:

#### EXECUTIVES SAY JOHNSON IS NOT PRESSING TAX RISE

The Johnson administration is urging the nation's top businessmen to speak up louder for a tax increase, but privately the businessmen feel it's the President who needs the pep talk.

The administration has sent an impressive array of officials to Hot Springs, Va., to spread the word on taxes during a private, two-day meeting of the Business Council, a select group of more than 100 of the nation's leading businessmen and industrialists. The meeting opened today.

Prior to the session, Commerce Secretary

Alexander B. Trowbridge told a meeting of the Young Presidents' Association here that although businessmen understand the need for an inflation-fighting tax rise, "they don't speak loud enough to be heard very clearly on Capitol Hill or in their communities."

#### FEELING IS MUTUAL

But in talks with business leaders attending the Hot Springs session, it appeared that many of them feel Johnson is not promoting his proposed 10 percent income tax surcharge measure with the energy he mustered to win a major tax cut back in 1964.

"I think he shows economic and leadership bankruptcy," said one businessman who claimed he had previously supported Johnson and was considered something of a "leftist" by the more conservative members of the council.

He said, Johnson had not pushed his tax increase proposal vigorously enough. "I don't think he is really sincere in advocating the tax increase," he added.

#### HOPE FEARED TOO LATE

But he and other council members believe Johnson will not give up on a tax increase. In any event, another businessman said, "I think it's too late. If there is a big buying rush at Christmas, with no tax increase by January, inflation will be here and it will be too late."

Nor are these questions of the President's sincerity entirely without foundation: because 6 weeks after his January 1967 message advocating a tax increase, the administration had reversed its direction and asked Congress to approve a \$2 billion tax reduction.

This sudden reversal of direction was reminiscent of the 1965 episode when the administration and Congress approved a \$1 billion reduction in excise taxes on communications and automobiles to be effective January 1, 1966, only to repeal this reduction just 90 days later. That established an all-time record as the shortest tax reduction in American history.

Let us review this record of other misleading statements as to budget deficits and expenditure reductions.

Let us go back to January 30, 1961, when President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, told Congress:

It is my current intention to advocate a program of expenditures which with resulting revenues from a stimulation of the economy will not of and by themselves unbalance the budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1962—that same year—was \$6,378 million, or more than \$500 million a month.

The following year, on January 11, 1962, President Kennedy addressed a joint session of Congress. He said:

I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1963 was \$6,266 million.

On January 14, 1963, President Kennedy in his message to Congress said:

I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

The deficit for fiscal 1964 jumped to \$8,226 million, or an average rate of almost \$700 million a month.

On January 21, 1964, President Johnson, in his first state of the Union message to Congress, said:

My proposals call for administrative budget expenditures in 1965 of \$97.9 billion—\$900 million less than required in the 1964 budget. . . . This marks an important first step toward a balanced budget.

The deficit for this fiscal year was \$3,435,000,000, or about \$300 million a month. The actual deficit this year based on past accounting practices was \$4.8 billion.

On January 4, 1965, President Johnson in his state of the Union message said:

We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget and a balanced economy.

The deficit reported for fiscal 1966 was \$2,251,000,000. I shall point out later how the actual deficit this year was over \$8½ billion.

On January 12, 1966, President Johnson, in presenting his 1967 budget, during his state of the Union message said:

If you approve every program that I recommend tonight our total budget deficit will be one of the lowest in many years. It will be only \$1.8 billion next year.

Their reported deficit for fiscal 1967 was \$9,937,935,200. The actual deficit, as I will later show, when you eliminate all the fancy bookkeeping, was over \$18 billion.

On January 24, 1967, President Johnson in his budget message predicted an \$8 billion deficit for fiscal 1968. I quote from that message:

Administrative budget expenditures will amount to \$126.7 billion in 1967 and \$135.0 billion in 1968. In these 2 years, revenues in the administrative budget are estimated to rise from \$117.0 billion to \$126.9 billion. As a result, the budget deficit will fall from \$9.7 billion in the current fiscal year to \$8.1 billion in 1968.

Estimates of the 1968 deficit now range from \$22 billion to \$28 billion.

As late as June 1967 when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee Secretary Fowler had revised the President's January estimate of an \$8.1 billion deficit and predicted a deficit of around \$11 billion.

Both the January and June estimates were based on the premise that the President would ask for a 6-percent tax increase, but as late as July 14, 1967, the administration was still uncertain as to its 1968 tax policies.

To confirm this latter point I ask unanimous consent that my letter of June 28, 1967, and Secretary Fowler's reply thereto on July 14, be printed at this point in the RECORD. This correspondence confirms that as of that date the administration had not made a decision on its tax policy for 1968.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., June 28, 1967.

HON. HENRY H. FOWLER,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to recent press accounts the Administration is planning to submit to the Congress sometime before its adjournment a request for a broad tax increase.

Before any tax increase is enacted many of us feel that certain recognized loopholes in our existing tax structure should be re-examined. I am therefore trusting that the Administration's decision will be submitted to the Congress far enough in advance to

give us adequate time to consider these revisions along with your request for new taxes.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, July 14, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your letter of June 28 suggests that some problems of loopholes in the tax structure should be re-examined in connection with Congressional consideration of a tax surcharge. You indicate, therefore, that the President's Message on Tax Reform should be submitted to the Congress in time for consideration in connection with the surcharge.

As you will realize, a number of factors must be taken into account in settling on the timing of specific Presidential requests to the Congress.

With regard to the relationship of tax revision to the surcharge, I would like to refer to the President's Economic Message where he said, "This work of basic reform should proceed independently of the requirements for raising taxes or the opportunities for tax reduction." When the surcharge recommendation is made in definite form, the Congress will want to concentrate on the central issues of the size of the needed tax increase and the timing. The needed rapid action could be lost in a protracted debate on substantive tax revision.

For this reason it seems desirable that tax reform and stabilizing tax rate adjustments be approached separately.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In January 1967 the President recommended a 6-percent across-the-board increase in our corporate and individual taxes. Six weeks later, in February, he was recommending a \$2 billion tax reduction—restoration of the 7-percent investment credit—and at the same time Secretary Fowler informed Congress that the administration's plan was to reduce the excise taxes on automobiles from 7 to 2 percent and the telephone tax from 10 to 1 percent effective March 31, 1968. These latter two actions would represent an additional tax reduction of over \$1 billion.

On August 3, 1967, President Johnson sent a special message to Congress canceling his earlier proposed 1968 cuts in automobile and telephone taxes and asked instead for a 10-percent tax increase, which would yield approximately \$7 billion on an annual basis. To support this proposal he predicted that without the tax increase the deficit for fiscal 1968 would approach \$28 billion or \$30 billion while with the 10-percent tax increase the deficit would be in the neighborhood of \$22 billion.

What happened between June and August that caused such a wide change in the administration's estimates of expenditures and deficits? The estimate in June of a potential \$11 billion deficit was based on the assumption of a 6-percent tax increase. In August based on a 10-percent tax increase the estimated deficit was projected at \$22 billion. Was this an effort to scare Congress into quick action?

However, it should be noted that the aforementioned deficits as reported do

not tell the true story. This is due to the fact that under the Johnson administration they have been juggling their financial statements, selling our assets—participation certificates—and diverting the proceeds into the general revenue as though they were ever-recurring income. This unorthodox method of financing our public debt has cost the taxpayers an extra one-half percent interest charge.

The silver content of our coins has been reduced with a resulting profit of around \$2½ billion to the Government. This profit has been included as a part of general revenue. Payments of corporation and withholding taxes have been accelerated to move additional revenue into the past 4 fiscal years.

#### ACTUAL DEFICITS, 1964-68

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal	Sales		Accelerated corporation tax payment	Excise and accelerated withholding	Seniorage	Total actual deficits
	Reported deficit	FNMA				
1964.....	\$8,226	---	\$300	---	\$69	\$8,595
1965.....	3,435	\$300	1,000	---	117	4,852
1966.....	2,251	1,840	2,900	\$900	649	8,540
1967.....	9,937	2,900	4,300	1,375	1,072	18,584
1968 <sup>1</sup> .....	14,000	4,000	1,600	---	519	20,119
Total.....	37,849	9,040	10,100	1,275	2,426	60,690

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$100,000,000 in speedup of withholding deposits and \$275,000,000 in excise tax payments from a monthly to a semi-monthly basis.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate, allowing for proposed tax increase.

<sup>3</sup> ½ of this includes the President's 1968 proposal for speedup in corporate tax payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This chart shows that during the 5 years from 1964 through 1968 the deficit of the Johnson administration will be in excess of \$60 billion, or \$12 billion per year, which is more than \$1 billion per month; and this based upon the conservative estimate of a \$14 billion reported deficit for fiscal 1968.

Not only has this administration been juggling the budget figures in an effort to mislead the American people as to the true extent of the deficit spending, but it has also misled the public as to the sincerity of its promises to curtail expenditures.

For example, on December 1, 1965, President Johnson, speaking from his Texas ranch, announced that he was issuing an Executive order to reduce civilian employment in the Federal Government by at least 25,000 jobs during the remainder of that fiscal year, which would end June 30, 1966.

This announcement was hailed throughout the country as a great step toward reducing the cost of Government.

What happened? Instead of reducing employees by 25,000 in the succeeding 7 months they actually added 187,506 employees.

The Budget Bureau estimates that these 187,000 employees, who were added in violation of the President's own Executive order, will cost the taxpayers over \$1½ billion per year.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an article appearing in the New York Times of December 2, 1965, concerning this reduction followed by a statistical

All of these nonrecurring items have been used as general revenue to defray current expenditures and thereby minimize the amount of the true deficit as it was being reported to the American taxpayers.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical report prepared with the assistance of the committee staff which takes all of these budget-juggling factors into consideration, and gives the true deficit for each of the fiscal years 1964 through 1968 as they would have appeared had normal accounting practices been followed by the Johnson administration.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

breakdown of the 187,000 additions to the public payroll in the following 6 months.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT BACKS A CUT IN U.S. JOBS—APPROVES PLAN TO RETIRE 25,000—SPENDS QUIET DAY

AUSTIN, TEX., December 1.—President Johnson approved this afternoon a plan that could eliminate 25,000 Government jobs.

The plan, contained in a memorandum from the Budget Bureau and released here, instructs the heads of Government departments and agencies to reduce their employment by 1 to 1.25 per cent by the end of the fiscal year 1966, which ends next June 30.

Joseph Laitin, assistant White House press secretary, said the plan did not mean that present employees would be dismissed. It is designed, he said, to take advantage of stepped-up retirements from Government jobs.

These retirements have been increasing because of a new law offering certain inducements, including larger pensions, to employees who retire before the first of the year.

"The vacancies thus created," the memorandum said, "present an opportunity to take new specific action to carry out the President's long-standing instructions to hold Federal employment at the minimum necessary to carry out Government operations effectively."

The President spent a quiet day at his ranch studying reports and preparing for a meeting tomorrow with Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

The main topic at the meeting is expected to be the world food situation and Mr. Johnson's forthcoming talk with President Mohammad Ayub Khan of Pakistan.

Mr. Rusk is expected to join Mr. Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara



for a discussion of world problems this week-end or early next week. The White House announced yesterday that this meeting would be held tomorrow or Friday. However, officials explained today that administrative work at the Pentagon would keep Mr. McNamara in Washington longer than expected.

The President also spoke by telephone with his special assistant for national security affairs, Mr. McGeorge Bundy. Mr. Laitin, in response to a question, said that the subject of Mr. Bundy's future had not been discussed and that, to the best of his knowledge, the two men had never discussed it. Mr. Bundy has been offered a post as head of the Ford Foundation.

Year and month	Employment	Increase
1965—December.....	2,550,742	.....
1966—January.....	2,555,572	4,830
February.....	2,580,518	24,946
March.....	2,610,780	30,262
April.....	2,644,153	33,373
May.....	2,685,160	41,007
June.....	2,738,248	53,088
Amount of increase December 1965 to June 1966.....		187,506

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But that was just the beginning of the false economy promises which were coming from the White House.

On September 20, 1966, about 6 weeks prior to the election date, the President, recognizing the criticism he was receiving from the previous action, issued an Executive order freezing employment at the level of that which prevailed on July 1, 1966.

Again this Presidential action was hailed throughout the country as a step, though belated, in curtailing unnecessary Government expenditures.

But like the similar statement in the preceding December, this was but another political propaganda maneuver. Instead of holding employment at the July 1 level, another 206,432 employees were added to the public payroll. All of these additions to the Federal payroll were above the normal replacements due to resignations, retirements, and so forth.

The cost of these additional 206,000 employees to the American taxpayers will be a minimum of \$1,500,000,000 annually.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the Executive freeze order of September 20, 1966, and a list of employees added thereafter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Executive order and the list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., Sept. 20, 1966.  
Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and establishments.  
Subject: Fiscal year 1967 employment ceilings.

1. The President has directed that the head of each agency take necessary steps to:

a. Hold employment in full-time permanent positions for the remainder of fiscal 1967 to a level at or below that prevailing as of July 31, 1966. (Those agencies whose employment is already above the July 31, 1966, figure should reduce their employment to the July 31 level as expeditiously as possible by not filling vacancies.)

b. Hold employment in temporary, part-time, or intermittent positions for the remainder of fiscal 1967 to a level at or below that prevailing as of June 30, 1966, except for meeting normal seasonal changes in agency workloads. In no event should such employment on June 30, 1967, exceed that on June 30, 1966.

2. These actions are an essential part of President Johnson's efforts to reduce Federal expenditures.

3. Each agency head should make every effort to achieve the lowest possible level of employment. We must increase our productivity, redeploy our personnel, simplify our procedures and strip work to essentials in order to meet the employment ceilings established by this memorandum.

4. In view of the personnel requirements involved in the Viet Nam conflict, the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System are specifically exempt from paragraph 1 of this memorandum. For these two agencies, employment ceilings heretofore in effect will remain in effect subject to adjustment during review of the 1968 budget.

5. In the case of the Post Office, the June 30, 1967, employment ceiling established in the January budget review will remain in effect.

6. Requests for exception to the levels established by this memorandum will be presented to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by the agency head under the following circumstances only:

a. When the need for employment increases can be related directly to requirements for Southeast Asia, or

b. When employment increases are needed for new programs which were not in existence on July 31, 1966, and for which appropriations or other funds have been provided and have been apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget, or

c. When employment increases are needed for emergency situations involving the protection of life, property, or the national security, or

d. When transfers of functions from one agency to another or from headquarters to the field result in a need to adjust employment levels.

In any of the above cases, exceptions will not be requested until the agency head has determined that it is clearly not possible to meet the required employment needs by redeploying personnel from other areas so as to remain under the employment level established by this memorandum. Exceptions will not be granted unless agencies clearly demonstrate that such shifts have been evaluated and that they are not feasible.

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,  
Director.

#### LIST OF EMPLOYEES

Year and month	Employment	Increase
1966—September.....	2,773,724	.....
October.....	2,798,212	24,488
November.....	2,834,940	36,728
December.....	2,842,528	7,588
1967—January.....	2,848,249	5,721
February.....	2,864,626	16,377
March.....	2,882,639	18,013
April.....	2,899,673	17,034
May.....	2,905,599	5,926
June.....	2,980,156	74,557
Total.....		206,432

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I regret the necessity for taking so much of the Senate's time to make this report, but I thought it necessary to review the record and to show the American people just how we have drifted into this near state of financial crisis. Also, this report is intended to show why there is so much uncertainty as to just how sincere the ad-

ministration is in its promise to cut expenditures or in its efforts to raise taxes.

I am not a pessimist. We have a great country, and I am confident that we can solve this financial problem with which we are now confronted. The stability of the American dollar not only can but must be preserved. This inflationary spiral must be checked; otherwise the life savings of millions of Americans will be destroyed. We can all agree that Congress has no alternative but to provide whatever is necessary to back the American boys in Vietnam. That comes first, but we can tighten our belts here at home. We can postpone or hold in abeyance some of the expenditures on domestic programs.

The most important steps toward the solution of any problem are first, to recognize that it exists; second, to understand what caused it; and then to be willing to take the necessary steps to solve it.

Both the administration and Congress know that our country, as great as it is, cannot stand these \$20 billion to \$30 billion deficits being piled on top of an already weak financial structure.

Both the administration and Congress know what caused this financial crisis—and it is a crisis when we are confronted with a \$30 billion deficit, an expensive war in Vietnam, accelerated inflation, and interest rates at the highest level in 100 years.

Both the administration and Congress know that unless some action is taken to check this inflationary threat the next step could well be a demand for price and wage controls. This could be disastrous to our private enterprise system.

Yes, the problem is here; we know the cause, and now let us, the administration and the Congress, get together and seek a solution.

In this respect I recognize that Congress too has a responsibility, and it is in recognition of our responsibility that I am making the following suggestions:

First. A bona fide reduction in Government spending, including the postponement of all new public works projects and the suspension of activities on all existing projects until such project or projects have been certified either as being essential to our national defense or that postponement would result in an unnecessary economic loss.

Second. Reduce the personnel on the civilian payroll of the Government down to the level existing on September 20, 1966, at which time President Johnson issued his Executive freeze order. This one action alone would reduce the public payroll by over 200,000 and result in an annual reduction in expenditures of around \$1.5 billion. This reduction could be achieved without hardship to present employees by merely curtailing all hiring for replacements of normal resignations or retirements.

Third. Repeal the fictitious 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. This ceiling is a farce and has cost the taxpayers several hundred million dollars in unnecessary interest charges.

Fourth. Congress should take definite action before it adjourns to settle the

question of whether there will or will not be a 1968 tax increase. Both the administration and the Congress have the responsibility to eliminate this cloud of uncertainty now hanging over our securities and financial markets by either accepting or rejecting the President's tax proposals.

This continued uncertainty can have a serious effect in financial markets and on our entire domestic economy; therefore, to facilitate this decision I recommend that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee or some Senator in the President's party introduce President Johnson's tax proposals in the U.S. Senate and then the Senate Finance Committee should promptly schedule public hearings.

It has always been traditional that the chairman of the appropriate committee introduce the President's recommendation even though he personally may not agree or be willing to support the bill. It is customary to introduce administration bills upon request.

It is inconceivable to me that the President of the United States could not get a single member of his own political party in the U.S. Senate to introduce his recommendations, or that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee would reject a request from him for public hearings on his tax bill.

If, however, the relations between the President of the United States and the members of his own political party in the Senate are of such a strained nature that not one will introduce his tax proposals I volunteer as the ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee that if he will send his recommendations to my office I will not only introduce them in the Senate but join him in petitioning the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to conduct public hearings. I have entirely too much respect for the Office of the President to have his recommendations completely ignored regardless of how we as individual Senators may feel.

By following this procedure the Senate would be able to move promptly after the House takes action, or if the House does not act, the Senate could, if it so desired, attach the bill as a rider to a previously House approved revenue measure.

There is a precedent for such Senate consideration before House action on revenue bills, and as an example I cite none other than the situation whereby for 3 days last week the Senate Finance Committee held public hearings on various proposals to impose quotas on oil, steel, textiles, and so forth. All such measures must either originate in the House or be attached as amendments to a previously enacted House measure. Likewise, the President's proposal to finance election campaigns out of the Federal Treasury was first introduced and hearings were held in the Senate. Furthermore, this procedure of Senate consideration before House action had administration approval.

I realize that these suggestions embrace some unpleasant steps. Adoption of these expenditure reduction measures would mean that some of the programs which I like, some of the projects in my State, as well as some of the programs

and projects in the States of other Senators would be affected. But real economy and a bona fide reduction in Government expenditures can only be obtained by every American citizen's recognizing the seriousness of our present financial situation and agreeing that all of us will tighten our belts and postpone some of these projects and programs which under normal conditions would be considered highly meritorious.

After these expenditure-reduction steps have been taken—and I emphasize "after"—if the financial position of our Treasury is still not under proper control, I would recommend that this Congress enact a tax increase before we adjourn. It may very well take a combination of a reduction in Government expenditures as outlined plus a tax increase to restore this country to a degree of solvency where the American dollar can be protected and the ravages of inflation avoided.

But I cannot overemphasize the importance that whatever action the administration and the Congress are going to take it should be done promptly and before this Congress adjourns.

This administration and this Congress have passed the laws drafting the youth of America, and we have today over one-half million American boys fighting in Vietnam for the protection of their country and the cause of freedom.

Daily those men are displaying heroic courage in the discharge of their assigned duties. Can we in the executive and legislative branches do any less in the discharge of our responsibilities?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I would like to be able to support the continuing resolution as it came from the House rather than the resolution now pending before the Senate which is simply a continuing resolution of the sort that we have passed many times in previous years and twice before this year.

I am in full accord with the House position of trying to save from \$5 billion to \$7 billion, but how they do it is another matter. The manner in which these cuts are to be made are very ambiguous; and when the resolution is examined closely, I believe it will be apparent that some very unfair cuts would be applied.

Director Schultze, of the Bureau of the Budget, did not know how the cuts would

be applied in many cases. He said that in many instances an interpretation of the Comptroller General would be necessary to determine what was required by the House action. He did give us some idea as to where he thought these cuts would be applied under the Whitten amendment to the resolution that passed the House. The Whitten amendment would require a cut of approximately \$7 billion, and the expenditure, not on appropriations, for the present fiscal year could not exceed 1967 appropriations, except in certain instances.

There were two or three exceptions, as I recall. One exception was for Department of Defense operations relating to Vietnam.

The Budget Director indicated that the cut might apply in the following manner: It would require a mandatory cut in the Defense Department appropriation of \$2½ billion on top of the \$1½ billion we have already cut in the regular appropriation bill and this at a time when war requirements in Vietnam are increasing. Agriculture would be cut \$400 million; Commerce, \$250 million; Interior, \$150 million; State Department, only \$10 million.

This cut would apply in the case of the State Department because its present appropriation is approximately the same as that of last year. I am not aware that the State Department has had any new functions added to its appropriation.

In the case of the Department of Agriculture, where the cut would be \$400 million, many new functions have been added from year to year which have little or nothing to do with agriculture. For example, the food stamp program has been added to this year's budget. In the last couple of years, we have added housing for towns and cities with a population up to 5,500 and under, and for farmers, to the Agriculture appropriation bill. And we have had the sewer and water system program added to Agriculture, which affects not only farmers but also towns and cities with a population up to 5,500.

So Agriculture would receive a larger cut because of the functions that have been added to the Department of Agriculture. The State Department would receive a cut of only \$10 million, which certainly would not hurt it at all.

The Veterans' Administration would be cut by \$180 million, and they have a vastly increased load because of the increasing casualties returning from Vietnam. I do not believe this department can afford any cut at this time.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks. These figures were presented by Budget Director Schultze before the Committee on Appropriations as to where he believed cuts would be required under the House Joint Resolution 888. It should be noted, however, that in many instances a determination by the Comptroller General would be necessary to know exactly how the House joint resolution would apply.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



*Areas where appropriations are controllable  
(not locked in)*

[In thousands of dollars]

Agriculture	3,900
Commerce	970
Corps of Engineers	1,300
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,500
Interior	1,600
Housing and Urban Development	1,100
Justice	437
Labor	530
Post Office	585
Transportation	1,500
Treasury	920
Agency for International Development	2,600
State	300
Atomic Energy Commission	2,600
General Services Administration	560
National Aviation and Space Agency	4,500
National Science Foundation	526
Veterans' Administration	1,600
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,060
Military and civilian pay raises	1,000
Other	2,000
Total	38,088

*House Joint Resolution 888—Estimated reduction effected by resolution as passed the House*

	1968 expenditures
Defense	\$2,500,000,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,100,000,000
Agriculture	400,000,000
Commerce	250,000,000
Housing and Urban Development	500,000,000
Public works	40,000,000
Interior	150,000,000
Justice	45,000,000
Labor	20,000,000
State	10,000,000
Transportation	75,000,000
Agency for International Development	140,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission	120,000,000
General Services Administration	30,000,000
Office of Economic Opportunity	400,000,000
Veterans' Administration	180,000,000
Pay raise	600,000,000
Small Business Administration	200,000,000
National Science Foundation	60,000,000
Total	6,821,000,000

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, these appropriations cut would be applied to what the Budget Director calls "not locked in" items, interest on the national debt, payments to veterans, and items of that nature would not be affected. The total of the "not locked in" items would be approximately \$38 billion, and to this amount would have to be applied largely the \$7 billion cut in the House resolution.

This would mean a sizable cut in many of these departments.

We are not exactly clear—at least I am not—as to whether the President could cut, say, \$5 billion in expenditures from the Interstate Highway trust fund. He withheld the spending of these funds last spring. Could he now withhold, say, \$5 billion in Interstate Highway trust funds to make up \$5 billion of the \$7 billion required under the House resolution?

These are only some of the ambiguities in the House-passed bill.

If we do not add amendments to the pending resolution, I believe everything would be in conference and we could come up with a much more understandable and effective resolution than the one we received from the House and still retain their objectives.

Of course, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which would require a 5-percent cut in all appropriations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### VIETNAM WAR

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and Secretary Rusk have recently made some significant comments about the war in Vietnam. It is good that they do so. I, too, submit some views in this regard.

At the very outset, I wish to say that American troops engaged in war in Vietnam deserve to be supported and supplied with all equipment and the materials necessary to enable them to accomplish the mission assigned them by their superiors with maximum effectiveness and minimum loss of life.

Let it be emphatically understood, however, that such support has not and does not reflect approval on my part of the policies and decisions that have led to our involvement in Vietnam in its current proportions.

Support of our troops in battle is one thing; approval of national policies and decisions which put them there is quite another. What has been done has been done. I voice my deep concern at this time, not with any idea that the calendar can be reversed; not for the purpose of expressing criticism, but in the hope that a searching public analysis and debate of the present may possibly be of some help in shaping the momentous decisions in the days and months ahead. The responsibility of a U.S. Senator and the dictates of conscience impel me to participate in the great, ongoing national debate now underway not only in the U.S. Senate, but also around every fireplace and coffee table.

I sincerely hope that what I, and many others, may say at this time and in the days to come will assist the American people in arriving at a collective national opinion as to just why we ought or ought not be waging war in Vietnam. For the really disturbing thing about this entire Vietnamese episode is that the country is cruelly and deeply divided and this division is affecting all phases of our national life. We must resolve the Vietnam question and arrive at a true unity. Only then can we get on with the task of fulfilling our national destiny. It is in this respect that I venture to speak.

Is U.S. security truly involved in the

war in Vietnam? For what lesser cause would we send men to fight and die? That has always been the central issue, as I have seen this problem. It is precisely on this level and upon this point that our policies, particularly our future policies, should be examined.

The real question posed by the recent statement of administration leaders is not whether it constitutes a change in our reasons for being in Vietnam, but whether this thesis is valid.

I do not think that President Johnson has shown—or that anyone has shown—that our national interest in Vietnam is "real." I do not believe that he has offered convincing evidence—or indeed any evidence—that no matter what the outcome of the war in Vietnam we will secure a peace that is either "organized" or "reliable." We have not yet achieved such a peace in the absence of conflict. How can we expect to achieve it through a major international disruption?

The truth, as I see it, is that the war in Vietnam is a quagmire into which we have stumbled, and from which we must extricate ourselves as honorably, as cleanly, and as gracefully as possible. Other nations have found the political courage, the will, and a manner with honor to extricate themselves from untenable and dangerous positions—Russia from missile bases in Cuba, France from Algiers.

The invocation of the threat of China—perhaps obsession would be a better word—is as true today as it has ever been. But does this establish a mortal danger for the United States in happenings in Vietnam?

I think that most experts on Vietnam would concur that North Vietnam is far from being an actual—let alone willing—Chinese puppet or satellite. Two thousand years of Vietnamese-Chinese relations have left the Vietnamese with feelings toward the Chinese which one eminent authority has described as "like those of the Irish for the English of Oliver Cromwell's day." And as the war continues—although the pronouncements of the administration repeat, and repeat, and repeat the view that it is Peking that stands behind Hanoi—the Soviet Union has become North Vietnam's chief military and economic provider. Chinese rifles and mortars are fired by enemy troops against American soldiers, but the North Vietnamese fly Soviet Migs, shoot down American planes with Soviet missiles using Soviet radar, move their armies with Soviet oil and fire Soviet artillery.

Several months ago, the Wall Street Journal reported that Soviet arms aid to North Vietnam totaled \$25 million in 1964, \$200 million to \$225 million in 1965 and about \$200 million in 1966. In the same years Chinese military aid varied from \$35 to \$60 million a year. It has been estimated that between 1955 and 1966 Soviet military assistance totaled \$1.5 billion compared to a Chinese total of some \$200 million. In October of last year at a meeting in Moscow, the Soviet Union and a number of other Communist countries reportedly said that they had agreed to help Hanoi with an additional \$1 billion in material and

money and only last month, when a new Soviet trade and aid agreement was signed with North Vietnam, the communiqué issued on that occasion stated that in 1968 the Soviet Union would provide: airplanes, antiaircraft and rocket equipment, artillery and small arms, ammunition, and other military equipment as well as complete installations, vehicles, oil products, ferrous and nonferrous metals, foodstuffs, chemical fertilizers, medicines, and other material.

Even taking the administration's case at face value—which I do not, except for purposes of argument—if the war in Vietnam is a confrontation between "Asian communism" and the free world, a confrontation that will determine not only the future of Asia but also the future of the United States—the battle is being fought in the worst possible place and at a place and under conditions of the enemy's choosing. And to carry this argument to its logical conclusion, if our real enemy is Communist China why do we not strike at the root of the problem? Are we unwilling to face up to the logical consequences of our policy, or do we suspect that there is a logical flaw in our argument?

I believe our leaders are mesmerized by mirages in Vietnam and that as a result they see national interests there where none exist. But this is only part of the tragedy of this quagmire war. The other part of the tragedy is that, mesmerized by mirages, we are unable to see where our real national interests lie.

It seems clear to me—it has for some time—that our real national interests lie in our present and future relations with the two other great powers in this world, the Soviet Union and China. What is the war in Vietnam doing to this fundamental national interest, to our relations with these two great powers?

Some believe that the war is bringing China and the Soviet Union closer together. The more sophisticated opinion is that the ideological differences between these two countries are so great that even an attack on a fellow Communist country has not been able to heal the breach—at least not yet, although I must say we seem to be working hard at it. But, unquestionably, the war in Vietnam is worsening our relations with both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and, I might add, with most of the rest of the world.

Let us debate our involvement in Vietnam, then, on a more rational basis than has thus far been the case, and perhaps we can then come to some national conclusion and true consensus as to just what we ought to do. Once we know what we ought to do and what we want to do, I, for one, believe our country has sufficient genius to find an honorable conclusion to this bloody war.

I have said that I am not persuaded that we have a "real" national interest in Vietnam; that the visions of containing Chinese expansion and deterring wars of national liberation are just that: visions, dreams. In any event, I do not believe we are containing Chinese military expansion in Vietnam. How could we be when we are fighting not a single

Chinese but have engaged half a million men in fighting against 50,000 North Vietnamese and 250,000 South Vietnamese Vietcong—a task the 700,000 South Vietnamese forces are apparently unable to undertake. Are we teaching China a lesson for the future when 100,000 American boys have been killed or wounded but not one Chinese has been scratched? Will this inhibit China from any desire to "overrun" her neighbors, as Secretary Rusk has suggested? And, for that matter, is China now "overrunning" her neighbor, North Vietnam?

If there is no Chinese military expansion to contain, perhaps we are fighting in Vietnam to contain local grievances. Whether any individual war of national liberation, by this or any other name, succeeds or fails in this or any other particular instance, it seems to me that the danger of a local Communist insurrection will continue to threaten as long as the conditions exist which permit such a movement to arise, enable it to grow, and encourage it to succeed.

We are in Vietnam, in the words of Secretary Rusk, only now clearly stated, because it is in our "vital national interest" to be fighting there, and the enemy is China.

President Johnson and Secretary Rusk presumably believe that we are fighting in Asia against Chinese aggression. Secretary Rusk, at least, feels—at least his words indicate he so feels—that we must not let any of the arrangements made at the end of World War II, arrangements which we hoped would guarantee world stability, to be reversed or undone. Our "vital national interest," he feels, demands that we fight a land war in Asia to maintain this particular brand of stability.

But does it? Now we reach the heart of the matter. Are we required in defense of the United States, to send an army to fight jungle guerrillas in any part of the world threatened with an alteration of the status quo? Is this advisable? Is it possible? Is it truly in our national interest?

I think the answer to these questions must be a resounding "No." We cannot police the world. To attempt to do so, outside of our truly "vital" areas, is to court national disaster.

We must act in our true national interest. This is axiomatic. In a nationalistic world—and let me say that we live in a nationalistic world, in the Communist areas no less than in the "free" areas—all nation-states operate in ways considered by them to be in their own national interest. This has been so ever since there have been nation-states, and I daresay it will be so for many years to come.

But when any nation's leadership has a false conception of what is the true, vital, national interest, the nation is in trouble. This is the case now. We are in trouble. We are a deeply troubled people—a deeply divided people. Secretary Rusk evidently fears that this conception of the national interest will not be supported by the American people. For that reason, perhaps, we have, since 1961, witnessed the erection of this facade and camouflage, using vague slogans about

"commitments" and generalizations about "freedom" and "aggression." These slogans have served only to confuse and give rise to unprecedented dissent.

President Johnson and Secretary Rusk seem to believe that our national interest is involved in the choice of a government for every country in the world. They have a right to hold such views. Others have a right to differ. I do. And I challenge the validity of the position that somehow the United States is placed in mortal peril by what occurs in the jungles of Vietnam.

Surely it is in our interest to have a peaceful world. Surely it is in our interest to have a less militant brand of Russian communism. Surely it is in our interest to have a China which will give up its desire to dominate Asia. Surely it is in our interest to have a government in South Vietnam friendly to the United States.

But having said that, I have said nothing, really. These statements are virtual tautologies. But this is what President Johnson and Secretary Rusk appear to have been saying, and on such a basis they seek to justify U.S. involvement in a land war in Asia.

I think they are mistaken. There is no personal criticism here. I am undertaking as studiously as I can to examine the position with reason and logic and no personal animosity is involved in it whatsoever.

We do have real and vital national interests—and these we must defend with whatever force is required. In such a case, the requirement is its own justification. But our vital interests must be more narrowly defined than they have been thus far by the Johnson administration. They cannot encompass all countries, freedom everywhere, vague commitments to every country no matter how remote, how small, how backward, or where located. And, so far as I am concerned, they do not justify a major war against China at this time.

Above all, in narrowing down our interests, we must balance capabilities with desires.

This, I believe, is where this administration has been at fault. The hard lines have not been drawn. The priorities have not been kept clearly delineated. We have drifted into a major war on the basis of vague commitments and a general defense of freedom. But, above all, and most important to the public debate on Vietnam, the administration has misled itself and the public as to our real national interests and intentions.

If, as I contend, our national interests—and even our existence—are tied to the future of our relations with the Soviet Union and with Communist China, the question we must ask ourselves is how Vietnam is affecting these relations. As I have said, I believe that the war is causing our relations with both of these countries to deteriorate. We complain about, and fear, China's militancy as we once complained about, and feared, Russia's militancy. Yet Vietnam provides China with a target enabling Chinese leadership to be even more militant and obliging the Soviets to compete in a contest that can only do us harm. What is that contest in which



China now challenges Russia? It is the great game of anti-Americanism.

Is it in our long-term national interest to facilitate this, to encourage this, to make it possible?

The war in Vietnam is thus reversing a trend in Soviet-American relations, a hopeful trend in terms of our future security and in terms of world stability. While our relations with the Soviet Union were by no means perfect before the war in Vietnam became largely an American war, the situation had certainly improved.

We and they are the world's two leading nuclear powers. I speak now of Russia and the United States. More than any other countries, we therefore have a basic common interest in avoiding a nuclear war, or a war which might become nuclear, for any nuclear war would be bound to destroy us both. It is paradoxical to reflect that these two countries, which were literally at each other's throats 20 years ago, now have a common interest—indeed a vital interest in every sense of the word—in preserving peace. What deeper mutuality of interest is there than the avoidance of nuclear war by the two nations bound to suffer destruction in a nuclear holocaust?

This common interest has produced tangible results. The first, and most important result, is that there has been no war involving the United States and the Soviet Union in direct hostilities. There have been close escapes—far too close for comfort—in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba, and now in Vietnam. But peace—peace in the sense of an absence of a war involving the armed forces of these two countries—has been preserved. And at the same time, there has been a gradual movement toward mutual accommodation, with agreements reached on a partial test ban treaty, an outer space agreement, the draft of a nonproliferation agreement, a consular convention and many executive agreements on various commercial, cultural and other matters. American citizens visit the Soviet Union and their citizens visit here. We exchange publications and cultural performances and our leaders meet to talk. While they do not agree on every subject they are able to communicate frankly and rapidly.

I do not mean to deny that many fundamental, serious—and even dangerous—problems remain. Even if the war in Vietnam ended tomorrow, there is a basic ideological hostility between ourselves and the Soviets that would undoubtedly persist for years to come and would inhibit the relationship between our two countries. The burden of past grievances—of broken promises and hostile actions—is indeed heavy. But the trend of events—the sweep of history—has been in the right direction between the United States and Russia. If there were to be as much progress in Soviet-American relations in the next 20 years as there has been in the past 20 years, or half as much progress in our relations with China, the future would look brighter indeed.

But as long as the war in Vietnam continues, the chances for such an improvement—for continuing this hopeful

trend—grow ever dimmer. And this is the other danger in our seeing mirages in Vietnam. The illusions we see necessarily blind us to the realities, both at home and in the world where American prestige and position is eroding.

So, again as I sincerely believe, we are not defending but damaging our national interests in Vietnam. Despite official disclaimers, we are bogged down in a land war in Asia fighting not Chinese but Vietnamese armed with Soviet equipment; dissipating that most precious national resource of all—American lives—as well as hard-earned American money; damaging our relations with most nations in the world and in particular with the two other most powerful countries in the world; and risking the danger that they will be dragged into the quagmire with us and cause a wider war—perhaps the war which will be the final holocaust. In short, we are not, as a high State Department official contended only a few days ago, “maintaining the balance of power,” but upsetting it.

At any rate, now that the administration is emphasizing the fact that we are in Vietnam in furtherance of what it feels are our real and vital national interests, we can debate on this level and the public can decide whether this is correct.

But for my immediate purposes, let me move a step further. What do we do now?

The administration says it wants to negotiate. But what is there to negotiate if we are truly protecting our vital national interests in South Vietnam? If in fact we are in mortal peril in Vietnam, what is there to negotiate? We are not going to be able to negotiate an American colony in South Vietnam. Moreover, would it really be in our interest to have an American colony in South Vietnam? If that is what the administration means by negotiations, we might as well forget that and begin sending over more U.S. troops. And if we are really fighting China, should we negotiate anything at this point?

There is something that may be negotiable, and that is the neutralization of Southeast Asia. So far as I am concerned, this would be in our true national interest. Thus far, the administration does not seem willing to negotiate on this basis.

A negotiated settlement is the solution on which there is broad national consensus. It has for some time been officially proclaimed policy of the administration. The difficulty has been that no way has been found to move the controversy to the conference table.

I wish to make clear that I do not question the sincerity of the Johnson administration in its statements that it desires to resolve the Vietnam conflict by peaceful negotiations. I doubt whether any man living desires peace more than President Johnson. I am sure that both diplomatic and unofficial channels have been used to convey our desire to negotiate.

On the other hand, it appears clear, both from administration statements and from our action, that we seek, primarily, to persuade the North Vietnam-

ese to come to the conference table by means of increasing military pressure. It is said that they will be willing to negotiate when they realize that they cannot win on the battlefield. The apparent theory is that when the military pressure reaches the point that it cannot be withstood, when the price becomes too heavy to pay, Hanoi will then be willing to bargain. In such case we would be bargaining from a position of strength and they, of course, from a position of relative weakness. In reality, this is tantamount to a declaration that we shall persevere until the North Vietnamese surrender.

If there are to be negotiations, there must be something to negotiate. True negotiations involve concessions on both sides. The subject of negotiations, if there are to be any, must be the political posture of Southeast Asia, in general, and South Vietnam, in particular, in the context of the East-West struggle.

Implicit in the statement of Secretary Rusk is that our national interest requires a Western bastion in Southeast Asia to contain China and to insure that Chinese domination does not extend to all of Asia. On the other hand, Hanoi, with the support of Peking and Moscow, seeks a Southeast Asia devoid of Western influence and a Vietnam unified under the control of Ho Chi Minh. Behind the facade of Communist bleatings about U.S. imperialism and our own slogans about self-determination, this is what the struggle is all about.

If we are willing to continue to pay the price in terms of military pressure, there is no way the North Vietnamese can achieve their objective. We have the military power to crush North Vietnam if we are willing to commit substantially larger forces to Vietnam than are there now and to invade and occupy North Vietnam. Even the proponents of a “hard line” in Vietnam concede that this would entail grave risk of war with China and possibly with the Soviet Union.

No one knows what Red China would do. It is my opinion that the Chinese would not allow Hanoi to capitulate even if Hanoi should wish to do so, in view of the fact that such would result in a U.S.-dominated Southeast Asia. We must consider possible Soviet reaction to such a possibility.

The question before the American people is whether, under the circumstances, we should be willing to accept less than what is and has been our real objective in Southeast Asia in return for a cessation of the conflict.

While we have stated our willingness to negotiate without conditions, we have not made clear, at least publicly, the kind of Vietnam we envision when negotiations have been completed, other than in such phrases as “independent,” “free,” “self-determination,” and the like.

Something less than our real objective in Vietnam would be the neutralization of Southeast Asia. It would also be something less than the apparent objective of the Communists supporting the Vietcong. It just may well be that an indication of our willingness to settle for neutralization would produce the negotiations we have sought for many

months. There remains the question of whether such a settlement would serve our vital national interests. In my opinion, it would.

There are some who equate neutralism with procommunism. Others may argue that a neutralist Southeast Asia is tantamount to U.S. surrender. Admittedly, we would prefer that all the states in the area be strongly pro-Western.

In reality, however, I believe neutralism is the best we can hope to achieve under present circumstances. Such a result must be measured in the light of the cost and the risks involved in continuing present policy, and in the light of more vital interests in other areas and in other respects.

It seems to me that it might be constructive to examine some of the possible reasons why the well-advertised peace offensive brought no affirmative response from those directly and indirectly supporting the efforts of the Vietcong against the Saigon government. First, there is the point of view that Hanoi has not responded because of a belief that the Vietcong will achieve a military victory, that if hostilities are continued the United States ultimately will become tired of the conflict and withdraw. According to this theory, the Vietcong, with support from Hanoi and Peking, will then defeat the Saigon regime militarily and engulf South Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia by force of arms. If the Vietcong leaders and the Communist leaders in Hanoi and Peking believe this, they should reassess their position. Recent votes in Congress should make it clear to them that despite reservations held by many concerning wisdom of our policy, the American people, acting through Congress, will provide whatever funds are required to support our military forces committed to battle in Vietnam or elsewhere. As one who believes strongly that we should not have committed combat troops to South Vietnam, I have consistently supported the appropriation of funds, and I have sought to make it clear that I do not advocate withdrawal of our forces under present circumstances. In my view, any reasonable analysis of the history of our country and of our people should convince both friend and foe that we will not be forced out of Vietnam by military pressure.

There is a possibility, although many refuse to concede it, that neither Hanoi nor Peking is in a position to stop the hostilities in South Vietnam, even if they should desire to do so. The general view is expressed by many that the Vietcong are merely puppets and agents of the Hanoi regime. On this basis, however, there are very few facts on the public record. There is abundant evidence of support from Hanoi, both in terms of manpower and material. I think there is little question but that officials in Hanoi are in a position to, and do, exercise a great deal of control over both the strategy and tactics employed by both their forces and indigenous forces in South Vietnam.

On the other hand, the same may be said about the Saigon regime. Hanoi and

Peking charge that the Saigon regime is an outright puppet of the United States. Without deciding this question, I think it is clear that the regime could not survive without both our economic and military assistance and the presence of American combat forces in South Vietnam. It must have been disconcerting, if not revealing, that in the recent Vietnam election the military junta that campaigned with all the trappings of power and obvious U.S. Government support received about one-third of the popular vote. Yet we are apparently not in a position to control the regime in all respects. Its cooperation is required to implement our policies. In some degree the regime can exercise a sort of veto. Of course, we hold a club over the heads of this regime, so to speak, in the sense that if it withholds its cooperation, we could threaten to withdraw our support. But this power is limited by the fact that use of it would require our withdrawal from the scene, and our Government is not prepared to do this.

In the light of the facts of record, I think it likely that we are in a position to impose our view upon the Saigon regime to an extent at least as great, if not greater, than the extent to which Hanoi can impose its view on the Vietcong. But our freedom of action is not by any means absolute, and it is possible that Hanoi's is not either.

For this reason I do not think we can simply dismiss the Vietcong as agents of North Vietnam. At least, it seems to me, we should recognize the possibility that Hanoi may not be in a position to dictate completely the course of action to be followed by the Vietcong except by exercise of its ultimate power to cut off support and withdraw completely from the conflict. If such conditions should in fact exist, Hanoi might conceivably find it as difficult as would we to exercise its prerogative of withdrawing all support.

This raises the question, Mr. President, of recognition of the Vietcong as a party of interest to be dealt with, should a negotiation of the controversy become feasible. Frankly, I do not see how a cease-fire could be negotiated over the heads of the Vietcong unless we assume that the Vietcong have no leadership at all other than that which comes from Hanoi. In the light of the publicly known facts, it seems to me at least possible that this is an unwise assumption.

On the question of dealing with the Vietcong, the position of the administration is not entirely clear. The President has said with reference to possible negotiations:

The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented, if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem.

I am unsure whether the quoted statement means or is intended to mean that we would consider negotiating with the Vietcong as one of the parties of interest or whether it means merely that it is our position that the views of the Vietcong could adequately be represented by Hanoi or someone else.

In my view the points should be clarified. I assume that the administration

has more information about the Vietcong, the individuals located in South Vietnam who are its leaders, its organization, and so forth, than is available to the public generally. It is said that the Vietcong have some kind of governmental or quasi-governmental structure, that it levies taxes and exercises other governmental powers in the areas of South Vietnam which it controls. There is bound to be some kind of local organization of the effort of the Vietcong on the local scene. Direction of the Vietcong military effort and its other activities simply could not be exclusively effected by those pulling strings from Hanoi. If such is in fact done, Hanoi has apparently perfected administrative techniques which are extraordinarily effective.

I do not have the facts upon which to base a firm conclusion about the degree of autonomy, if any, exercised by Vietcong indigenous to South Vietnam. It is my hope that more facts on this point will become available and it is my hope that the administration will clarify its position on this point in the interest of facilitating possible negotiations of the controversy.

If negotiations are to be held, it is first necessary to determine the parties who are to be participants. In considering this matter it is pertinent to note that the struggle now underway in Vietnam is, in many respects, but a continuation of the conflict which began after World War II which the Geneva accords of 1954 attempted to resolve. The "settlement" in Geneva involved all of what was generally known as Indochina. Dissident elements in the areas known as Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam were in revolt against the French. Separate cease-fire agreements were reached with respect to each of the three areas, but they were all a part of the same package.

U.S. policy in Vietnam cannot be considered separate and apart from our policy in all of Southeast Asia. If there is to be a political settlement it must be a settlement to which all concerned will subscribe or agree.

No lasting settlement or accommodation can be achieved if negotiations are conducted only among major powers with the thought that the terms upon which the major powers agree can be imposed upon Southeast Asia without regard to the wishes of the people there. In my view, if negotiations are to produce lasting benefit, they must involve discussions at multiple levels.

First, if negotiations are held under any conditions short of total destruction of the Vietcong, it would seem that there will have to be negotiations between the Saigon regime and the National Liberation Front.

At the next level up the scale, negotiations will be required between South Vietnam and North Vietnam for the purpose of resolving whether and under what circumstances the reunification of Vietnam is to become a fact or whether there are to be two permanent sovereign nations.

Negotiations will be required on what may be called the Southeast Asia level including participation by Vietnam—



North and South—Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma for the purpose of determining what will be the relationship among these countries and resolving such conflicts as may arise.

Further negotiations between major world powers will be required if there is to be an accommodation with respect to major power interest in Southeast Asia. Without such an accommodation there could be no lasting stability in this area of the world.

Fifth and finally, there should be negotiations at the United Nations level to invoke the seal of world opinion on the overall settlement.

I do not suggest that there should be five different conferences running seriatim or concurrently. It does seem to me, however, that the question of peace in Southeast Asia involves understandings and resolution of problems at each of the levels I have indicated. A settlement dictated from above will surely come unraveled if it merely covers up and does not resolve possible conflicts of interest at each level. The problems of bringing about negotiations in such depth are formidable and challenging, but if we are to avoid the wider war about which concern has been expressed, something along this line will be required.

Another possible reason why there has been no affirmative response to the President's call for negotiations is that Hanoi, Peking and/or the Vietcong—if indeed the Vietcong does have an identity separate from Hanoi—may feel that they do not have sufficiently certain knowledge about our objectives in Vietnam and in Southeast Asia generally. This is not simply a question of whether our official statements are to be believed. I refer rather to the fact that official statements by the President and the Secretary of State are sometimes not specific about the kind of Vietnam we seek or would be willing to accept. Without in any way undertaking to attack the credibility of the administration, I must confess that there is some doubt in my mind about the official position of the United States with respect to some of the subjects upon which it would be necessary to reach agreement if there is to be a meaningful negotiation of the Vietnam problem.

President Johnson has stated on numerous occasions that we seek only limited objectives in Vietnam and that the United States is prepared to participate in "negotiations without preconditions." I, at least, am not sure just what this means. I interpret Presidential pronouncements in this regard to mean that the United States would not insist upon banning discussion of any relevant issue raised by any party to negotiations and that we would not in advance stake out any issues, as many as are negotiable.

I do not see how any statement could be broader in terms of our willingness to discuss anything with anybody at any time, but in essence such statements are of a procedural rather than a substantive nature. They do not constitute a policy or a program for Southeast Asia; rather they reflect, perhaps, our disposition to keep an open mind on any question.

The most concise and complete statement of the U.S. position with respect to

negotiations of which I am aware was included in the presentation of the Secretary of State in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In his prepared statement the Secretary outlined the limited nature of our objectives. He disavowed any selfish motive for our involvement in Southeast Asia, and he reiterated the 14 points which, when issued by the Department of State on January 3, were described as "elements which the United States believes can go into peace in Southeast Asia."

The recent statements of President Johnson and Secretary Rusk are ringing. Unfortunately, however, the specifics of what we actually propose as an alternative to a war for total victory in Vietnam are not so clear. By way of illustration I cite the vagueness and ambiguities inherent even to this day in official statements on just what our position is.

First, I have already referred to the lack of clarity in official statements about the role, if any, that would be played by the Vietcong if negotiations are held.

Second, in his statement before the committee, Secretary Rusk said:

What we seek in South Vietnam is to bring about a restoration of the conditions contemplated by the Accords of 1954.

A somewhat similar statement is incorporated as point No. 1 of the 14 points which outlines our position. Point No. 1 provides:

The Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I do not know what these statements mean. The Geneva accords contained provisions for a cease-fire which were to be followed by free elections throughout Vietnam which were scheduled to be held in 1956 for the purpose of establishing a government in all of Vietnam in accordance with the wishes of the Vietnamese. I will not at this time go into the reasons why these elections were not held, but the fact is that they were not held. And we know why they were not held. The point to which I now address myself is the fact that the Secretary does not now speak of elections to be held throughout Vietnam but only of elections in South Vietnam. This is not what was "contemplated" in the Geneva accords of 1954.

U.S. position with respect to elections is set forth in point 9 of the 14 points. It states as follows:

We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

Later in his testimony before the committee, as found on page 655 of the hearings, Secretary Rusk again made it clear that when he spoke of elections he meant elections in South Vietnam.

This is far more than merely an exercise in semantics. It goes to the heart of the question of whether we have in fact totally rejected the concept of reunification contemplated in the Geneva accords in favor of a permanent division of Vietnam into two nations.

Point No. 10 of our 14 points states:

The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision.

I confess also, Mr. President, that I do not know what this statement means. In the light of Secretary Rusk's testimony, and subsequent statements by President Johnson and the Secretary of State, I do not believe it means that the United States has agreed to endorse and abide by elections to be held throughout Vietnam. Perhaps it may mean that after dual sovereignty is established, the question of reunification should be determined by the people of the two nations acting separately in accordance with the majority will in each.

In my view, it would be helpful if our position on this question were clarified.

Third, Point No. 8 of the 14 points states as follows:

We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured.

Of course, Mr. President, we do not "desire" to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured. But by so stating we do not outline the conditions under which we would agree to withdraw our troops.

Obviously, troops from some source will have to remain in Vietnam for a number of years before peace is assured. Just what do we propose in this regard? Is there perhaps a proper role for the U.N. to play in providing an international security force along the lines of that dispatched to the Middle East to assure that the terms agreed upon at any conference are fulfilled? It seems to me the point is worth developing.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the eloquence of President Johnson and Secretary Rusk, I have neither seen nor heard a clear statement of the kind of settlement we would seek by negotiation if negotiations are held. I doubt if we can realistically expect meaningful negotiations until there is such a statement.

It is perfectly proper to say and to reiterate that we will confer with anybody at any time at any place and about anything. I observe, however, that if discussions are held with no more concrete an agenda than this, they are unlikely to be fruitful. It is said that we cannot afford to lay all of our cards face up on the table lest we be asked to make concession in the interest of reasonable compromise. There is some validity to this argument as a general proposition. If our proposals are fair, however, as I am sure ours would be, and if they were presented from a position of strength, which our forces already in Vietnam assure, there is no reason why we should be called upon to retreat from them.

There is certainly no guarantee that a more precise statement of U.S. objectives would bring our adversaries to the conference table. I believe, however, it is worth trying. We should continue to avoid imposing "conditions" for negotiations, but I believe we should propose more clearly and more precisely the conditions for peace.

We have stumbled into a morass in Vietnam. We must decide to negotiate ourselves out of it. We must decide—decide definitely and irrevocably—to negotiate disengagement from Vietnam, not from Asia but from Vietnam, honorably and honestly, which means, in my opin-

ion, on condition that Vietnam be neutralized.

Having lost our innocence in Vietnam, can we retain our honor? I believe that we can because of the common interests—if we and they can but see them through the smoke and fire of war—that exists even between the North Vietnamese and the people of the United States. Even between antagonists there are common interests—common interests that are forgotten in the heat of war where the first casualty is always truth and the second might be said to be objectivity.

The first common interest we share is a desire and need to end the war. American lives are being lost and American treasure spent, but the North Vietnamese are losing far more. By ending the war, we could save our lives and our precious material resources. But they could save their country.

The second, and more subtle, common interest is that it seems logical to me to assume that neither the North Vietnamese nor, for that matter, the Soviets would want necessarily to see the United States humiliated and bereft of power in Asia, for the result would surely be a surge of Chinese influence throughout the Asian Continent. A peace with honor is, therefore, not only essential for us; it should be essential for North Vietnam as well, if she still clings, as she has clung for a thousand years, to her own nationalism.

Of course, if our vital national interest demands that South Vietnam be a U.S. satellite, we should not try to negotiate neutralization. But, in my view, such is not the case.

There are indications that our position and policy in Vietnam is now under review, or has been under review. Careful review is certainly imperative.

It is disturbing to recall that each time our policy has been reviewed by President Johnson, the result has been a deeper involvement, a further escalation. As we have become more heavily committed, step by step, the problem has become more complex, solutions have become more elusive, and the potential consequences of any course of action have become graver.

This pattern of step by step escalation of our commitment, accompanied with repeated assurances that "we seek no wider war," concerns me greatly, and I am apprehensive that this pattern may now be continued.

We have been told repeatedly that we are in Vietnam only to help the Vietnamese help themselves. This was not to become an American war. But we have gone by successive stages from the extension of economic aid, to military aid, to military "advisers" and technicians, to troops to protect vital American installations, and finally to full-scale offensive commitment of U.S. ground forces and bombing of North Vietnam. It has become an American war, and now involves, we are told, our vital national interests.

From a review of the record, it seems clear to me that we have no legal commitment that requires us to expend the effort we have undertaken in Vietnam. What actual commitment we have there,

we have managed to create for ourselves. It is as if, by saying over and over publicly that we are committed to restore order and tranquility in South Vietnam, we have somehow convinced ourselves that we are legally bound and honor bound to do so, whatever the cost.

In addition to whatever formal legal commitment we may or may not have in Vietnam, there is what is called our moral commitment to assist a people in quest of freedom. Lest we be carried away by this emotional, idealistic appeal, let us remember that there are many other Communist regimes, in China, in Russia—yes, and there is one in Cuba. Our moral commitment to liberate our neighboring people in Cuba should be at least equally strong. Even so, it does not necessarily follow that we should launch a major military effort to overthrow Castro. These indefinite "moral commitments" have their limitations. They must be measured by our own "vital national interest."

In the final analysis, we should be guided by these vital national interests. It has long been my view and, as I have said, it is now my conviction that our national interests are not served by a major military operation in Southeast Asia.

Even if we accept the inevitability of military solutions to cold war problems, it is difficult to imagine more disadvantageous conditions under which to wage war than those which prevail in South Vietnam.

Moreover, we stand virtually alone in the struggle. We have received only token support from a few of our small allies. Other free world nations do not even agree with what we are doing in this unhappy area. They find it difficult to understand why we are there, why we wage war there. It is not that our Government has failed to declaim our position. It is, I believe, simply that they do not believe that either their interests or our vital interests are served by this war. In going it alone, we violate the sound principle of collective security to which we committed ourselves when we subscribed to the United Nations Charter. We cannot, standing alone, remake the world, and it does not serve our vital national interests to try on the scale and under the conditions which prevail in Vietnam.

We must be guided, I submit, by our position and our posture on a global basis, with recognition of the fact that our strength, though greater than that ever enjoyed by any other nation, is not limitless.

As we have become increasingly committed in Vietnam, other pastures look correspondingly greener to our major adversaries. The Soviets were and are tempted, I believe, to encourage trouble in the Middle East by our deep involvement in Vietnam. They may be tempted toward other adventures in Latin America, in the eastern Mediterranean, in Berlin, in Africa, or elsewhere in Asia. If so, our heavy commitment in Vietnam lessens our capability to respond quickly and effectively, or at least the Communists may think so.

Every time the war is escalated, the

danger of war with China, and perhaps with Russia, too, increases. If we continue to escalate, such a conflict may well become inevitable. With or without initial Soviet intervention in a United States-China war, such a conflict would almost certainly degenerate into a nuclear war. We could hardly fight the hordes of Chinese on their home grounds without resort at least to tactical nuclear weapons. And when nuclear weapons are used, the very existence of our civilization is in jeopardy.

Mr. President, these are some of the difficulties and some of the dangers we face. From the standpoint of our national interest, the basic question is whether the stakes are sufficiently high to warrant the risks we assume. In my view, they are not.

Once more, I earnestly advise and entreat that this war be kept within bounds which appear manageable, with limited goals and limited commitments, that goal being a tolerable political arrangement that would permit honorable disengagement of U.S. combat forces at the earliest feasible time. Once again, I advise and entreat against a wider war, against a commitment to total military victory in a major war in Asia. Once again, I urge the view that this would be contrary to our true national interest. Here, it seems to me, is the great issue now under debate, as I have said, not only in the U.S. Senate, but also around every fireplace and around every coffee table.

I do not say lightly that we are not serving but disserving our national interests in Vietnam. I say it with the deepest of convictions and would only say so while entertaining such convictions.

Secretary Rusk said last week that "the debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail." I think that he is quite wrong. We are not debating about "detail" but about the most important questions a nation can debate: Whether its sons are dying for a true cause, whether its leaders perceive or misperceive where the country's vital interests lie, what the present promises for its citizens and the future holds for its heirs. These are the questions that all of us—and particularly those of us here who hold a public trust—must ask ourselves without fear of the consequences.

#### THE RIGHT TO DISSENT IS A DISTINCTION OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the right to dissent is a distinction of democracy. Difference of opinion has marked every war of our Republic including the Revolution that gave us birth.

Only a third of the colonists fought that war for freedom. One-third remained staunchly loyal to Britain. One-third sat on the sidelines—uncommitted.

History repeats itself. We defend the right peaceably to assemble—even when the dimensions of the assembly are overplayed by our modern miracles of communication. Such was that Washington assembly Saturday.

Some media saw it in its proper light. The Providence Sunday Journal of last



Sunday, in part, made this comment:

The eyes of the world were on Washington this past weekend. . . . Both those who marched and those who watched or read should remember that the right peaceably to assemble and protest is not a license to abuse the rights of others, to interfere with the operations of a city or to hamstring the functioning of our government. The right peaceably to assemble and protest carries the responsibility of doing just that—and only that.

If the demonstration had held within peaceful bounds, the guard would have been superfluous—but there was disorder—and there was no choice but to bring it under control.

Now, the majority of the marchers were peaceable—and the militant minority only damaged their cause—and brought shame on themselves—and shame on all of us if the world thinks that they represent America.

One commentator declared it "was difficult to repeat publicly the ugly and vulgar provocations of many of the militants. They spat upon some of the soldiers of the front line at the Pentagon and goaded them with the most vicious personal insults."

And these soldiers—thus vilified—might be your sons—obeying the command—serving at the post of duty.

What the post of duty means to a soldier—and to his father—is exemplified in a letter I had the honor to receive this past week.

Above all the headlines of hate—above all the mad marches of the misguided—above all the voices of violence—to turn from the spit-stained walls of the Pentagon to the beauty of this letter is to find a faith in America refreshed and renewed.

Mr. President, there is evident between the lines of a letter from a father's heart an exhortation of patriotism and pride in his fellow men. I am honored to read to the Senate this father's letter.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,

October 12, 1967.

DEAR SIR: First may I extend my sincere thanks for your assistance a year or more ago, when at that time, I asked your help in determining, due to an ear injury, whether my son a member of the United States Marine Corps, was fit for combat duty.

Mr. President, the next two paragraphs are complimentary to me. They are not pertinent to the point I wish to make and, therefore, I shall skip them and I shall now read the next paragraph:

It has been a good many months since you were of such tremendous help to me. I thought you might be interested in knowing that my son, this boy whom you did so much for, has just returned home to Providence on a 30 day leave.

He has volunteered to return to Viet Nam and leaves Providence on Nov. 4th to return directly to his outfit in the Third Marine Division where he has been stationed in the D.M.Z. for the past 15 months. He has been at the Marine outpost at Con Thien. He returned home with two Purple Hearts. The first time he was hit he was flown to the hospital ship Repose where he spent 35 days and then flown back to his outfit just below the border zone.

His second wound was from a poisoned bamboo stake which penetrated the sole of his shoe when he dropped into a hole the VC had set up with these poisoned stakes sticking up in the hole.

I am neither a Dove nor a Hawk, and must admit that I have been, and still am very confused as to our policies in Viet Nam. However one thing I am sure of, leaving aside our policies, I can now state that there is no doubt in my mind as to whether or not we should be there. After spending many long hours, late into the night, talking to my son, talking about all phases of Viet Nam I am firmly convinced that we have no choice—we belong there—we can't pull out. We have to see this through to the end.

I have given my only son to this cause, he has been returned to me for 30 short days, at the end of this leave he will return to Viet Nam. There is a very good possibility that we will never see him again. I think therefore I can speak with authority. I am convinced that he should go back. Just as I am sure that while we don't have a solution, we have got to keep going, there can be no wavering, there can be no indecision, we need neither Doves nor Hawks.

It is very easy for a person to get up on the floor of the Senate and criticize, but what constructive substitute is this person offering to help our cause? There is no one who has more at stake in this Viet Nam affair than I have.

I have a tremendous amount of respect for you, the President, and all the others who have the weight of responsibility for solving Viet Nam on their shoulders. There have been mistakes made in the past and there will certainly be more made in the future.

None of us are God, we are all from the President on down just human beings, who will make human mistakes, wrong judgments, and all the other weaknesses that make us human.

All we need is a firm determination that we are right, a united front, and a will to win, with these three simple things the more complicated solution to this Viet Nam problem will come in time. A return to the idea of my country right or wrong wouldn't be a bad start.

I only wish there was some way that I could get across to our vacillating country that our biggest enemy is not the V.C. or the Chinese, or the Russians. It is simply our own lack of determination, will to win, and whole hearted support of our President and our duly elected representatives.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK B. JOHNSON.

## CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the clerk restate the first committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof," strike

out "November 23, 1967" and insert "November 15, 1967."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

### AMENDMENT NO. 416

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will first report the second committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 1, line 6, strike the following language:

And by adding the following language:  
"Provided further that for fiscal year 1968, unless hostilities in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia should cease earlier, Federal spending of appropriated funds except expenditures from trust funds by each Department and Agency of government, including the Legislative and Judicial branches, except for military expenditures of the Department of Defense directly related to our involvement in Southeast Asia, including pay of all military personnel, the payment of interest on the National Debt, payments under the Social Security Act, veterans and other retirement benefits, medicare and old age assistance payments, shall not exceed the amount expended during fiscal year 1967, except that the limitation on the Department of Transportation shall not be more than 95 per centum of the Budgeted amount for 1968. Provided further that where deemed necessary to maintain mail service, the President is authorized to exempt the Post Office Department from the provisions of this Act; and provided further, should the President deem it necessary for collection of revenue, he is authorized to exempt, to the extent necessary, the Internal Revenue and Customs Services.

"Provided further that such reduction of expenditures insofar as practical may be made by stretching out the time schedule of performance and payment on contracts so as not to require the elimination of new construction starts, and by each Department and Agency not filling vacancies.

"Provided further, that net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed \$131,500,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of \$22 billion that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia.

"Provided further, that appropriations made by Public Law 90-102, as amended, shall be available for activities budgeted under 'Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Opportunity Program' at a rate not in excess of that which would be provided for by an appropriation of \$1,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"Sec. . . Obligations during the period by section 1 hereof for activities to be authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 (S. 1872 or similar legislation) shall not exceed an annual rate of \$2,000,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on page 1, line 6, beginning with the word "and", insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Subsequent to the enactment into law during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress of the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968, the executive branch is directed, subject to subsection (b), to reduce

by at least 5 per centum each line item appropriation (other than appropriations for military functions and those items determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget not to be subject to administrative control) contained in such bills.

(b) In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations reduced in accordance with subsection (a), the President may make such transfers between appropriation accounts as may be necessary, but no such transfer shall cause any item of appropriation to be increased to an amount in excess of the amount provided in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I said in the Senate yesterday, in discussing in detail the amendment which I mentioned I would offer today, the purport of my amendment is simply to add to the continuing resolution, in which we have just agreed now to the date in November, a meaningful manifestation and an effective effort to associate the Senate of the United States with the House of Representatives in its efforts to bring about economy in this period of perilous inflation. So my amendment would mean, in addition to extending the date to shortly before Thanksgiving, that we would also include instructions to the President that we want a 5-per cent cut in appropriations of those controllable expenditures which are listed in the committee report and in the hearings, and where it is possible to bring about these economies.

In order to be abundantly sure that this is done in an effective and efficient manner, it provides, in the second paragraph, that the President shall have the right to exercise limited transferability; so that if there is, in his opinion, and on the basis of information provided by his expert advisers, certain particular line items which could not be cut by 5 percent without damage to our national security, such as the FBI, for example, or which would do damage, perhaps, to a situation such as we confront with the constantly increasing number of veterans being handled by the Veterans' Administration, a lesser cut, or no cut at all, could be made in those areas, and a larger cut in other areas where economies can be very definitely implemented. So that the overall picture is a 5-percent cut, as against a basic factor of \$38 billion to \$40 billion in controllable expenditures. This would mean that we would instruct the White House to bring about a further cutback of \$1.9 billion or \$2 billion, as against the appropriation levels passed by the Congress of the United States.

In brief, this amendment offers the Senate an opportunity to join with the House in an effective effort to bring about some order in our fiscal policies, which everybody now realizes have gotten so far out of hand that we face the necessity, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said so eloquently this afternoon, of having to pass a big tax surcharge. Even with that, the tax money so raised would amount to only as much as my amendment would permit to be saved, when we totalize it in terms of economy effectuated by the Congress.

Mr. President, if conditions are bad enough to justify increases in taxes, they are bad enough to justify some economies being implemented by this Congress

first; and if we did both, we would be bringing about a situation providing perhaps \$12 billion in a saving of expenditures as against a \$26 billion projected deficit for this fiscal year. So we would still be well over 50 percent beyond the anticipated deficit which the President of the United States announced was going to be the result of his budget when he gave us his budgetary message last January and told us we would confront only an \$8 billion deficit.

I believe the country wants, and it is very obvious because of its action that the House wants, and I think the Senate should want, this particular Congress to do something to meet these challenges. I think we ought to have less spending, and I think the country wants less spending, less deficit spending, in this era of war. I think we ought to provide action to create less inflation. I think that is imperative if we are not to impose upon the poor people of this country, and those with fixed incomes, the elderly, and those on the farms and ranches who have little protection against it, what the President has rightfully called the cruelest tax of all—the tax of inflation—because the effect of inflation is exactly like that of a tax increase. It reduces the purchasing power of the householder. It reduces the purchasing power of every citizen of this country precisely as though a national sales tax had been imposed, to reduce the capacity of his earning power and his resources to supply the needs of his family.

Mr. President, I think the country is tired—just dog tired—of this Congress and this administration following any longer the hypocritical theory which originated with Harry Hopkins when he said they were proposing to spend and spend and spend and tax and tax and tax. I thought we had had enough of that Harry Hopkins era, but we are right back to it again, and somebody has to break this logjam.

I think the country is sick and tired of this buckpassing between the President and the Congress. My proposal involves a joint effort. It is—I repeat—a good faith amendment. If we are to bring about any economies, we will not get them by Congress begging the President to tell us what economies he is going to bring about before we pass a tax bill. We are not going to bring economies about by having the President say, "Pass a tax bill and, some day, I will surprise you by telling you how I will effectuate some economies." We have had this stalemate for over a month. The time has come to break it and get action. This is a joint effort; this is a cooperative effort; this is not a buckpassing effort. This tests the sincerity of the White House, as it tests the sincerity of the Congress. Do we want to economize or do we simply want to talk about it some more with happy and pious and meaningless phrases?

The statistics are about as follows. The Congress has economized to the extent of about \$2 billion on the appropriation bills which we have thus far enacted, which means that we have given the President about \$2 billion less than he requested. That is an economy brought about by congressional action. On the remaining appropriation bills that are in

conference or that have not yet been enacted, it is hoped we can save another \$2 billion or perhaps \$3 billion. This means that we expect to reduce the Presidential requests by a total effort of from \$4 to \$5 billion.

By this amendment we will slash back from controllable expenditures approximately another \$2 billion. So we will wind up with a total congressional saving, if my amendment is adopted, as against the budgetary requests of the President, of between \$6 and \$7 billion. That is almost the precise amount the President says he will get by taking it away from the taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax, if Congress makes it possible for him to do so.

I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] makes good sense when he says we may have to do more than recognize the \$2 billion we have saved, the \$2 to \$3 billion we would expect to save, in the remaining appropriation bills, and the \$2 billion to be saved by the Mundt amendment. We may still face a tax bill and the necessity of passing one, because the fires of inflation are burning hotter every day. Pick up any newspaper; ask any financial economist. This country is flirting with financial disaster while Congress and the President engage in meaningless buckpassing and counteraccusations as to who should initiate economy.

The House has met that challenge. The House has proposed to cut out an amount roughly estimated to be \$7 billion by adopting an amendment the ramifications of which nobody can define accurately.

The testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations is in the hearings. As I said yesterday, I hope every Senator will read the hearings before he votes on these decisions, because the hearings are a small package of about 85 pages. The most meaningful discussions begin at page 49 and end at page 73. What occurred prior to that was merely the old drama of buckpassing.

Director Schultze was saying, "You cannot economize in this way; you cannot economize in that way. You cannot take that course of action. The House action is wrong here; it is dangerous there, it is discriminatory there."

Finally, I said, "Mr. Director, we have been listening for 2 days to the dirge of 'do nothing.' Do you or do you not believe that the Nation faces a financial crisis?"

He said, "Yes," because he is an honest man.

I said, "Look ahead. Let us throw away the big, composite basket of nyets and noes and try to find some way in which we can light a little candle in the darkness and move down the road to economy."

We had the able assistance of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. His questions are in the hearings. He induced the Director of the Budget, finally, to list the items, the agencies, the activities, and the functions of the bureaus and departments of the Government which have a total of almost \$40 billion which is controllable by reductions; where there are no fixed charges; where there would be no effect on vet-



erans' pensions or interest on the national debt; but on which we can work and as to which we can tailor some kind of economy measure.

So I urge my fellow Senators not to delay longer. This is almost the end of October. We have been talking about economy for more than 10 months. Now we have a chance to do something specific about it. The era of conversation should be past, and the period of action should be here.

I do not think it is the proper approach to take the House action per se, and lock up in conference with no flexibility and no right of review a \$7 billion cut spontaneously initiated on the floor of the House of Representatives. My proposal will give us some flexibility of action.

It will provide an opportunity for review and careful analysis. We will put the Senate of the United States on record in favor of economy, just as the House has been put on record, and will take to conference those messages from both Houses. We will meet in the old U.S. Supreme Court Chamber. We will have the whole picture before us. We will have the record of definite action by the House membership before us. We will have the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee, which was another approach to a cut, before us. We will have this proposed amendment before us, and, within the broad boundaries of those limitations on the conference committee, we will have just one simple directive: "When you come back, do not come back with just a continuing resolution that says 'Mr. Taxpayer, we ducked the issue, we delayed the decision; we do not want to face up to the facts.' Come back with some economies included."

We will be under a mandate from both Houses of Congress saying, "Do something about some economy. Do not wait until November 15, when it is too late to make any appropriate deductions, to make that decision which you should make now, but sit there in conference until you come up with a continuation resolution which has some meaningful words in terms of reducing Federal expenditures."

I think that one big merit of my approach is that it does not lock any doors. It does not freeze anything into a fixed formula. It enables us to bring in the Director of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the heads of agencies, and search out some places where we can make cuts with the least pain and agony to the public and the country generally and which are most conducive to the public interest.

I am not saying we can make cuts that nobody will oppose, or that we can expect to find some happy places where we have been so reckless in our expenditures that we can save a couple of billion dollars completely painlessly. But we have to have a priority list. We begged and pleaded and tried as hard as we could to persuade the Director of the Budget to suggest some priorities, and we were unsuccessful.

But my amendment provides complete flexibility of action. We can rewrite the approach; we can fix the amounts; we

can expand or decrease the limit of transferability; we can raise or decrease the economy percentages; we can take the House amendment; we can take the amendment of the House Appropriations Committee; or we can take the Mundt amendment but we cannot come back and say, "No, our colleagues of the House and the Senate, we have ignored your mandate for economy and we are just going to keep on spending." For there will be a mandate from both Houses to economize.

So my amendment, first of all, puts a mandate on the U.S. Senate for some belt tightening.

Second, Mr. President, I am not going to vote simply for a continuing resolution, even if I am the only Senator to vote "No," because to do that is to repudiate and reject the House of Representatives, which, by a majority of 110 votes, said, "We want some major economies"; and they enacted it into their bill and sent it over to us. I shall not be among those who would say to our colleagues in the House of Representatives, "You do not know what you are talking about, saving. That is an old fashioned notion. What do you mean by passing something to save some money?"

I salute the House Members for their effort. I applaud them for the diligence with which they approached the problem. I think there are some errors in their approach. We should approach the matter with the greatest degree of skill and efficiency possible. But I am not going to repudiate their efforts to bring about some economy by saying, "Oh, no, we in the Senate say, 'Just continue the resolution to November 15 and go on record as asking for no economy at all.' Count me out when that rollcall comes. I will be voting a perhaps very lonely "No."

Third, this gives the Senate a positive approach, a positive formula for action, rather than continuing a do-nothing attitude of negativism, whereby we simply postpone and defer decisions which we actually should have been making 2 months ago, if not 4 months ago. We have run out of waiting time; because we are approaching the end of this session of Congress and of this calendar year.

I point out again that this amendment would provide us with latitude, in conjunction with a directive of both Houses of Congress to meet in conference and bring back to both Houses for further consideration the approach recommended by the conference for economizing in this particular session of Congress, and with this particular budget.

Mr. President, if the Senate has the will to economize—and I do not know; I have heard the speeches, but I suppose we are going to have to test it with a vote—but if the Senate has the will, this is a way. I am talking only about the Mundt amendment. I am talking about the fact that we will have placed before this council of our elders, the ranking members of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, meeting in conference together, a mandate to cut back on expenditures now.

That is the way. I repeat, if we have the will, this is the way; this is the place; and now is the hour. Let no one delude

himself into saying, "I will just vote for a continuing resolution now, as I did in October and as I did in September, and then maybe just before Thanksgiving Day, we can settle the whole thing on some sunny afternoon."

That cannot be done. It will take some time. It takes time to establish priorities. It takes time to study and rationalize the differences between the two Houses. So above all, I hope we do not duck the issue this time when we vote today or tomorrow.

Some criticisms of my amendment have been raised, Mr. President. I share in the criticism. It is not a perfect approach. I suppose one reason why, at this late hour, we are still scrounging around trying to find the answer is that there are no perfect approaches. A lot of good men and true have been working on the problem, planning on it, and trying out amendments; but there is no perfect way to reduce expenditures. There is no painless way.

But it can be done, with prudence. It can be done, with skill. It can be done, after careful examination—if we have got the will to do it. We cannot do it by delaying the decision to November 15 or some other magic date.

If some Senator comes up with some other proposal, during the course of the debate, which will supplement mine, or improve it and help to accomplish the objective with prudence, efficiency, and effectiveness, I shall support that proposal. My amendment, I am convinced, would be a move in the correct direction.

Some have said, "Ah, this is a Presidential item veto." They recall speeches that I have made on the floor of the Senate against the item veto by the President.

I am against the concept of a Presidential item veto. I opposed it when President Eisenhower suggested it. I oppose it now. I opposed it for 10 years in the House of Representatives, and have opposed it for 19 years in the Senate. I shall continue to oppose it as a *modus operandi* for financing the Government in ordinary times and as permanent prevailing policy.

But we face an emergency. Make no mistake about that. I oppose appropriating great amounts of money for military events which do not occur. But when we are in a war, I vote for the appropriations and support them, just as I shall vote to meet this emergency on the home front as it confronts us here and now.

Mr. President, for those who are leery about the fact that our old Senate colleague, President Johnson, is going to single out some of those who vote for economy now and say: "All right. You asked for it. Here it is—all in your State, all on your project, all on those special programs with which you are associated."

I said yesterday and repeat now—Republican partisan though I am—that I do not believe President Lyndon Johnson would play ball that way. I do not think he would engage in that practice. I do not think he would try to victimize those who are concerned that if they vote for economy they will lose something for their State. I believe he would not stoop to such tactics. He might, and he could,

of course. But woe and alas I discovered that he can do it anyhow. He can do it now.

I am going to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this juncture an extract from Public Law 759 of the 81st Congress, enacted in 1951, at which time we gave the President the right to exercise essentially an item veto in connection with mandates of economy which we directed to him.

The President has been exercising it at times. We have not all agreed with the decisions he has made. Some have complained that he does not have the constitutional right. I do not know about the constitutional right, but he has the legislative right because we gave it to him.

The Senate can reject my amendment unanimously, but it would not by such action take away that right. If somebody wants to repeal that law, let him speak up now and advocate it. Otherwise my amendment would neither decrease or increase his power over our appropriations.

If rescission of that power is advocated in normal financial times, I will join in the advocacy of such a proposal. I doubt that I would vote to repeal now this concession which we have made because of the perils we are today confronting on the fiscal front.

It is under the apportionment process. Let me read it.

Generally speaking, all appropriated funds must be apportioned to the Bureau of the Budget before they are available for obligation by the agency to which appropriated.

Section 665(c)(1) of title 31 of the United States Code provides:

Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, . . . shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof.

And we added a new paragraph reading:

In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible, . . .

It is through this procedure that the executive department exercises control over appropriations granted by the Congress.

We are all familiar with the Presidential withholding of funds and delaying of funds and postponement of funds which have been appropriated. So, I submit that while reference is often made to the constitutional aspects with respect to the exclusive right of the Executive to make use of the appropriations granted by Congress, there is statutory authority cited by the statute. So it is no longer necessary to resort to a constitutional argument, at least until such time as Congress decides to repeal the authority which we have freely and meticulously conveyed, and it is a part of the law today and has been since 1951.

If some Senators are still skeptical, if

they are still worriers about the fact that if they vote for economy, they will lose an apple off a tree in their own backyard, let me point out that even then Congress has not surrendered its weapon.

Suppose the President should do that—which I am sure he will not do—in a vindictive spirit, to try to penalize especially those who advocate economy. Would that leave us powerless? It would not.

The last bill we will pass, Mr. President, before we adjourn—if we ever do adjourn this year—will probably be the final supplemental appropriation bill. Usually, it keeps us here until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning because it is the last thing that comes up.

If the President should unwisely and unfairly and unnecessarily or vindictively slash some appropriation which should not be slashed, the same Congress that giveth is the Congress that can taketh away. And we can shore up that appropriation with a supplemental at that time.

If the President were to do this after we had adjourned—when we do adjourn, late in November or some time in December in time for New Year's Eve, or whenever it is—one of the first bills that we would pass in 1968 would be a supplemental appropriation bill for the new year, and we can correct the situation then.

So, I say to my friends that they should not worry about this. This is a good-faith amendment. This is a fair-play amendment. This is not trying to slip a Mickey Finn to the President. It is not trying to gain any advantage for Congress. It does not expand the existing Executive authority.

It merely states that working in harness under this kind of approach we can do something to save the taxpayers some money. Perhaps we can stop the tremendous drive toward inflation. Maybe we can provide for a delay in the institution of a tax bill. I do not know. That is a matter for the Finance Committee to decide. But my amendment provides for a cooperative effort.

There is not any way that the President can take advantage of this Congress even though he has this amendment and the directed authority outlined in it. The authority has been there now for 16 years.

Presidents have tried once or twice to stop certain activities of Congress by the exercise of a strong Executive arm, and Congress has changed their opinion and made different decisions. We can do it again. We still control the purse.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that some of the news stories and editorial comments which I read about the U.S. Senate disturb me because I would hate to think they are true. I cannot believe they are true. But they picture us as a body of spenders engaged in squandermania. They do not realize that when the House passes a bill and it comes here several months later, new authorizations have been added and new conditions have arisen and we frequently have to add more money.

It has been said on the other side of the Capitol: "The Senate is the Upper House. We in the House economize, and

the Senators load on extra expenditures." It is not true. But this time we confront a challenge which might make it ring pretty true and might in fact make it true since they took this courageous step—and it was not easy in the House—but they made this meritorious effort to economize and in return we say: "Forget it. We laugh at you. We are just going to continue in the merry old way we have been going." I suspect that the editorials and the comments will get worse if we are guilty of such evasion and inaction.

Here is a UPI story. It says:

The Senate Appropriations Committee junked a House-passed economy ultimatum to President Johnson Friday and approved a simple extension of spending authority for fundless government agencies.

I do not know whether we junked it. It was turned down with four dissenting votes. We failed, but we tried to tie in an alternative proposal. We lost the first time on a 10-to-10 tie vote. We lost the second time by a vote of 14 to 8. But I do not want to have the United States Senate plead guilty to the fact that if we now do nothing at all we are junking an economy effort made by the House.

Perhaps we can modify it. Perhaps we can improve it. Perhaps we can alter it. But I pray you, let us not junk it. At least, we are not guilty, I hope, of that particular definition of junketeria.

Second, here is an editorial from the Sunbury Daily Item of Sunbury, Pa. It is typical of a good many which have come to my desk in recent days.

I am not sure where Sunbury, Pa., is, but I am sure this is a well-read newspaper published in a fine American community.

It starts out by discussing the financial situation of this country and the various proposals. It then quotes our distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Delaware, as say: "Never before in history has any man in the White House said so much about economy and done so little about it."

If the Senator from Delaware said it, it must be true. But if we here in the Senate do nothing about this now, the editorial can change a couple of words and say: "Never before in the history of this country has the U.S. Senate talked so much about economy and done so little about it." I should hate to have that happen but if it is true of one, it is true of the other. This is the test.

I ask unanimous consent that the UPI story and the editorial from the Sunbury Daily Item be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SENATE PANEL KILLS BUDGET ULTIMATUM**  
WASHINGTON.—The Senate Appropriations Committee junked a House-passed economy ultimatum to President Johnson Friday and approved a simple extension of spending authority for fundless government agencies.

However, the action came after a 10-10 tie vote defeated a proposal for five percent across-the-board cuts. In line with the House demand, it would have forced spending cuts of about \$1 billion in the current fiscal year. The five-percent proposal, aimed at \$38



billion worth of programs where government spending is not locked in by legal requirements, was offered by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D. Committee Republicans said they will try again when the Senate considers the stop-gap appropriation legislation next week.

The extension of spending authority for government agencies to Nov. 15 was finally approved 16 to 4. No vote was taken on the House-approved economy action which would make it mandatory to hold non-Vietnam spending to last year's levels.

[From the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item,  
Oct. 10, 1967]

#### THOUGHTS IN PASSING

Honest confession is good for the soul, but there is no apparent inclination on the part of the Johnson administration to humbly acknowledge that reckless, at times witless spending has gotten out of control.

Why a proposed reduction of \$5 billion in proposed expenditures of \$135 billion during the fiscal year has created such agony and led to such palpable evasion of responsibility is not readily understood by the average citizen. A householder with an allotment of \$135 who could not readily find ways of economizing to the extent of \$5 would be considered inept. The great difference between those who loosely handle the public's money and those who spend what is left to them after tax grabs is that the former considers the sky the limit and the average citizen knows from harsh experience that he cannot endlessly permit outgo to exceed income—that always there comes a day of reckoning.

The shocking record of the Johnson administration recently cited by Senator John J. Williams of Delaware, involves deficit spending in the amount of \$60 billion during the past five years, notwithstanding the fact that budget levels have gone up and up and up. This means an average expenditure of more than \$50 million a day over and above tax receipts. Also interest charges on this added debt amounts to \$3 billion a year which requires three per cent across-the-board in income taxes, or nearly one-third of the ten per cent tax boost now sought of Congress. Even so, the national debt pyramid, now at the \$334 billion level, is in for another elevation due to another projected deficit—at least \$29 billion unless the Johnson demand for a 10 per cent tax hike is granted.

Ways of reducing federal spending are numerous, but wielding the meat axe has political implications that both the White House and the Congress shun like the plague. In this hiatus savings of only \$2.86 billion have been toted up by the House Appropriations Committee and the painful quest drags on. Action Wednesday night for a \$7 billion cut, the President to do the paring, is one more abdication of responsibility.

As Senator Williams says, "Never before in history has any man in the White House said so much about economy and done so little about it." Typical was the promise Mr. Johnson made in December, 1965 to reduce federal payrolls by 25,000, followed in the next seven months by the addition of 187,506 jobholders. Also there was the recommended elimination of certain excise taxes in January, 1966, followed two weeks later by reinstatement of those levies.

As the people grow poorer under the double pressure of taxation and inflation produced by spendthrift policies, honest confession is the point of beginning for what the nation needs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall desist now, with the determination to resume if anything is to be gained by debating the matter further; but I desist with one repetitious plea: I hope Senators will read the RECORD. I hope Senators will read the painful procedures by

which it was finally possible to evolve a percentage formula for bringing about some economy. Those who live in the optimistic opinion that we can just duck the issue now and meet it again on November 15, when much of the money will have been spent, should read what Director Schultze said about the long and tortuous process of arriving at a priority list.

It took me a half hour or 45 minutes to get him to agree at all that it could ever be done, and then he calculated the time in periods of weeks that it would take, and they would have to know the entire financial picture at the time they began, and then once again relay to Congress any recommendations they might make. But time will not wait—we cannot stop the calendar. That process would take us deep into 1968 before decision time arrives again.

This is salutary reading. I believe every Senator should read the RECORD of this debate and the hearings before he makes up his mind on the issues now before the Senate.

Mr. President, reserving the right to resume, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate does have a responsibility to demonstrate not only to itself and the House of Representatives but also to the country that we, too, recognize the seriousness of our fiscal situation and are willing to do something about it.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota it would reduce the appropriations by \$1.8 billion. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator's understanding is reasonably accurate. It is a sort of flexible figure which can vary, depending upon what we do with the remaining appropriations bill, but it will save between \$1.8 billion and \$2 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding.

The original resolution as passed by the House proposed a reduction in expenditures of \$6,820,000,000. If we accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota and reject the House amendment we would reduce expenditures by \$1.8 billion rather than \$6.8 billion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It would not mean that. It would mean that we had proposed an alternative approach to economy which would effectuate from \$1.8 billion to \$2 billion of economy now, but in conference would also be the \$6.8 billion proposal of the House. And I presume that some place between the two, after careful examination of all the facts, would be the point of compromise and agreement which we would bring back to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Conceivably, they could bring back the complete text of the House proposal, or, conceivably, they could accept only the amendment agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Or any place between.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Or any place between, as the Senator points out.

The Mundt amendment is a step in the right direction, but I question that it goes far enough. I believe we have reached the point at which we will have to cut these appropriations until it hurts each of us by eliminating projects in our respective States. We cannot escape that situation if we really want to reduce expenditures.

As I pointed out today, in earlier action on 13 appropriation bills the Senate has added a total of \$4,055,148,620 of spending money over and above that which was approved by the House of Representatives, and these same bills as passed by the Senate were \$3,175,648,998 above the appropriations for these same agencies in 1967.

It is true that they were somewhat below the 1968 budget requests. The pending Mundt amendment would reduce this amount by \$1.8 billion, but I believe we will have to go further than this if we are to avoid a painful tax increase or if we want to check this inflationary threat.

On September 26, 1967, Representative Bow introduced his proposal which would have accounted for a reduction of \$5 billion in spending authority for fiscal 1968. I will read his first resolution:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed \$131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond \$72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine are necessary.

Continuing, the second section provides for a rescission of the \$5-billion obligational authority which would result from this reduction in expenditures.

The Bow amendment, as proposed on that date, would have provided for a reduction in expenditures of approximately \$5 billion. The same proposal or a similar one was included in the pending resolution as it was passed by the House. This original Bow amendment had been amended on the floor of the House to bring the total reduction to \$6.8 billion.

We now have a parliamentary situation in which if the Senate supports the Mundt amendment, with its proposed cut of \$1.8 billion, it would strike out the proposal of the House and send the bill to conference with a cut of only \$1.8 billion.

This is a difference of about \$5 billion; however, if the Senate will attach the Bow amendment to the Mundt amendment it would then mean that the Senate would be on record in favor of reducing the 1968 expenditures by around \$6.8 billion, or about the same amount as approved by the House of Representatives.

The Senate prides itself upon being recognized as the Upper House, but let us not make that title symbolic of the Senate's "upping" of expenditures. Thus far the Senate has a poor record in this Congress when it comes to reducing expenditures; this is a chance for us to redeem ourselves.

I believe that we should add the Bow amendment to this pending proposal and demonstrate that the Senate, likewise, is willing to cut expenditures. Why pass this responsibility on to the conferees or the

House of Representatives? Let us accept it right here.

I realize, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, that we are conferring upon the President certain discretionary power over where these cuts will be made. I regret the necessity for doing this, but we have no choice. We are now in the position where most of the appropriation bills have cleared the Senate and are in conference. This may be our last chance.

Therefore, I suggest that we amend the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to include the original Bow amendment, as introduced on September 26. This proposal was approved by the House by an overwhelming vote. Its adoption would provide for an additional reduction in expenditures of \$5 billion. If we add this proposal to the Mundt amendment we would then go to conference with a proposal calling for a reduction of \$6.8 billion.

This is just about the same amount as the reduction approved by the House.

This is the Senate's chance to tell the country that we really intend to check these ever-increasing expenditures.

It should be pointed out that if we accept the Bow amendment, which I shall offer, spending in fiscal 1968 would be reduced not to exceed \$131.5 billion. The expenditures in fiscal 1967 were approximately \$126.5 billion. This means that while there would be a saving of around \$5 billion, at the same time the administration could still spend \$5 billion more than it spent last year. This would certainly provide leeway enough.

In addition, the amendment provides an exception that if Department of Defense expenditures go beyond \$72.3 billion for military purposes and the President determines it is necessary to increase such expenditures he will have the authority to do so. There would not be a ceiling on expenditures necessary to finance the Vietnam war. That is true also of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

If this amendment is approved, however, as an addition to the Mundt amendment it would reduce expenditures by a total of between \$6.5 billion and \$7 billion. By so doing, we would demonstrate to the country that we are making a bona fide effort to roll back expenditures before we act on a tax bill.

I do not think there is any question but that the Senate will have to face up to the responsibility of making a decision on taxes before Congress adjourns. At least, we should face up to such a decision and decide the question, either affirmatively or negatively. Earlier this afternoon I discussed the reasons why I thought such action was necessary, so I shall not labor the Senate further on that point now.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes an amendment, at the end of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], to insert the following:

"SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall not exceed \$131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond \$72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine are necessary.

"SEC. 106. Not later than ten days after the last day of the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, estimated administrative budget expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall be reduced, through the apportionment process, by \$5,000,000,000 (the difference between currently anticipated administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1968 of \$136,500,000,000 and \$131,500,000,000). Obligational authority in an amount equal to the \$5,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures shall no longer remain available, and such sum shall be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is identical to the Bow amendment as introduced on September 20, 1967, and it would provide for an additional \$5 billion reduction in expenditures for 1968. This is in line with the action taken last week by the House.

I am willing that there be a vote, and, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we are going to enhance the stature of the Senate very much if we have a vote on an unwritten amendment of this magnitude and complexity without having a chance to examine it in print; nor do I think we are really measuring up to our statute if we vote on either of these amendments until they have been discussed before at least more than a dozen Senators. More than twice as many as have heard this debate discussed the matter in the Committee on Appropriations. We have perhaps a dozen Senators in the Chamber and most of those who are now present are members of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not think Senators should make up their minds on this issue by perhaps flipping nickels as they come over to the Chamber from their offices.

Before voting on an item that has not been printed, and that involves the entire financial structure of the Government, I urge that we cease and desist until tomorrow, and then the amendment will be printed, and we could hopefully have at least one-third of the Senators present to determine what we can best do to avoid bankruptcy. I do not want to vote today until Senators have had a chance to read the RECORD. This is not fair to them, and this is not fair to future generations of taxpayers in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to this amendment's being carried over until tomorrow. I point out, however, that this is not a new proposal. It is identical to that made by Representative Bow on September 20, which proposal later passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. It is a part of the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 888, which is presently before the Senate and which was considered by the Committee on Appropriations. Hearings were held. My amendment would carry out exactly that

part of the Bow amendment which is included in House Joint Resolution 888 but which would be stricken by the Mundt amendment.

The amendment which I am introducing does not include the Whitten amendment which was added on the floor in the House of Representatives. This is the Bow amendment which is referred to in the printed hearings which are on the desk of every Senator.

There is nothing new in this proposal. It just puts the Senate in a parliamentary situation whereby we can get a direct vote on the proposal passed by the House of Representatives last week.

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I want to send to the desk an amendment and to have it printed—and I may desire to call it up tomorrow—which is somewhat similar to the Williams amendment but not subject, perhaps, to some of the technical differences which may exist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, frankly, I think there is a great deal to support what the Senator from South Dakota has said at the moment. Many of us came to the Chamber earlier this afternoon and we were prepared to proceed on this matter and to stay on the matter all afternoon. We immediately got involved in one speech that was pertinent and another speech that was not pertinent to the business at hand.

Having spent a great many hours in the Committee on Appropriations these last few weeks with both the majority party and the minority party on this matter, I think that is one of the gravest matters concerning us.

Frankly, I am concerned about some of the implications of the Mundt amendment, but I am just as concerned about the resolution as it is reported from the Committee on Appropriations because after receiving from the House a resolution which I believe in its actual and practical aspects is unworkable, but nevertheless exhibiting on the part of the House a desire to confront themselves with the very critical fiscal situation in this country, I think this matter needs a good deal of airing and explanation.

I returned to my office this afternoon when we got into these extraneous matters and I became involved with some matters touching my constituents and I did not get back to the Senate Chamber even in time to hear the statement of the Senator from South Dakota.

However, I personally feel that the Senate would be subject to a great deal of dereliction if we sent to the House of Representatives a continuing resolution after their great effort over there to show their concern with the fiscal situation in this country, even though we modify that resolution and put in the date November 15 instead of November 23.

Now, the Senate has to face its responsibilities. I have a great deal of discussion which I may want to contribute to this matter also with respect to our fiscal situation. I would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from West Virginia, the acting majority leader, as to



whether he is willing that at this time this matter do go over until tomorrow.

Frankly, it is a matter of great inconvenience to me. There is a very important meeting which begins tomorrow evening in Colorado involving my party and involving all 11 Western States. I was expected to be there with some other Senators and it is a matter of great inconvenience, but also this is a matter of great importance.

I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader what his intentions are. If we have to vote on this matter now we will do it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In response to the distinguished Senator from Colorado I wish to say in view of the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota to the effect that he does not want to have a vote this afternoon either on his amendment or on a perfecting amendment, I am trying at the moment to work out some agreement between the two, and then I should like to consult with the majority leader.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, that being the situation, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my understanding is that an agreement is now being worked out between the majority leader and the other Members; therefore, under those circumstances, I yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado very much for his generosity and courtesy.

#### CONFEREES ON HEW APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD INSIST ON SENATE POSITION ON BELTSVILLE FDA SITE IN LIGHT OF HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appeal today to the conferees on Labor-HEW appropriations to reopen in conference the question of the site for the proposed new Food and Drug Administration Laboratory. This laboratory building should be located in Beltsville, Md.

I make this request of Senate conferees and House conferees in light of the scathing criticism of FDA procedures in this matter made by the House Committee on Government Operations last Friday.

I referred to this House committee report yesterday in the Senate, page 29685. This respected House committee, after a careful study of FDA procedures and the history of this question, has issued a devastating case against the

restriction inserted in the appropriation bill by the House to prevent location of the facility at Beltsville and, in effect, force its location in Madison, Wis.

Senators will recall that the Senate Appropriations Committee rejected this House language and the Senate confirmed that judgment.

Mr. President, the fact is that the Beltsville site is the most economical one and the original FDA cost study showed it would be at least 5.4 million dollars cheaper to build it at Beltsville. It is no secret that the pressure behind the House Appropriations Committee action to force location of the facility at the more costly site in Wisconsin is a minority member of that committee from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, is not this situation one of remarkable paradox? The minority member on the one hand claims to be leading a fight for economy, but on the other hand he uses his position in the Appropriations Committee to force location of the FDA laboratory in his State at a severely greater cost to the taxpayers.

It may offend the rules of this body to suggest inconsistency or bad faith on the part of a Member of the other body, so I will not make such comments. Nevertheless, the facts do have a peculiar ring.

I ask the conferees to reopen this question because the House Government Operations Committee report makes an overwhelming case that FDA selected the Madison site as an alternative—and I quote the House committee report—"without an adequate study and without complying with HEW site selection regulations."

Moreover, the House committee report states that during hearings on FDA's appropriation in this matter:

FDA witnesses did not mention the disadvantages the agency had previously stated would result from location of Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 in the midwest.

Mr. President, in other words, FDA witnesses withheld pertinent information from the House Appropriations Committee. The House report goes on to say:

In fact the attitude expressed by FDA was completely inconsistent with its previously stated position.

The report states:

No mention was made of FDA's own estimate that the alternative site would substantially increase initial and operating costs.

The House Government Operations Committee concludes that the procedures used by FDA in selecting an alternative site for Headquarters Laboratory site No. 2 were "completely inadequate."

Mr. President, the appropriations bill, H.R. 10196, is still in conference. On October 4, the House returned the bill to conference with instructions to reduce items to budget request figures and to effect other economies. Therefore, it appears both possible and appropriate for this question to be reopened.

It would be highly appropriate, in the light of the new evidence in the House committee report and in the interest of economy and efficiency, that the confer-

ence reject the House restriction and instruct the FDA to build its new lab at whatever site economy and efficiency require. I am certain that regard for economy and efficiency will dictate that the lab should be at Beltsville.

Mr. President, not only will construction and operation of the facility in Madison be more costly but this radical geographical shift will also force the expensive relocation of personnel from the Washington area.

I believe that my constituents in Maryland and all the taxpayers of the United States deserve better treatment in this matter and that the laboratory should be in Beltsville.

Mr. President, I am today making this request by letter to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Senate conferees. I commend to all members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and to the Senate the summary of the Government Operations Committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have the perfect answer to the proposal just raised by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. The most modern Air Force base in the country, at Glasgow, Mont., which cost about \$150 million, and which has everything, is about to go out of existence—in July 1968. So if anyone is looking for something which will be economical, efficient, and already in being, I would suggest that these Senators who have divergent viewpoints look to Glasgow, Mont. They could not make a better choice. Everything is there.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, half-hour of debate be allowed on the pending Williams amendment, and that the vote on that amendment take place at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following action on that amendment, the Mundt amendment be considered, and that there be a time allocation of 1 hour on that amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the manager of the joint resolution or whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the majority leader, who is to control the time on the Williams amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request is not in order at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment is on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator will get the yeas and nays.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to suggest, in order to expedite the time, that, in the event other amendments were offered, as far as I am concerned, we could have unanimous consent that on any other amendments offered there be a limited time—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of one-half hour, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Several other matters have come up here, including a conference report. Is there anything in the unanimous-consent request that would preclude me from offering, at the proper time tomorrow, the amendment which I have sent to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing which has been proposed in the unanimous-consent request that would preclude the Senator from Colorado from doing that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair. I have no objection to the time limitation that has been requested, except that I would not want a time limitation in the event I called up the amendment which I have just sent to the desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent that on all other amendments, there be a half-hour, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and that there be 2 hours on the joint resolution; and, if need be, more time will be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have no objection. I think it has been very fairly stated. I was wondering whether or not the majority leader might be inclined to enter into an objection to any committees meeting between 12 o'clock and about 2:30, the time of the vote, so that at least Senators could be here if they wanted to be here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not be averse to that request if the Judiciary Committee could meet, because it is faced with a deadline imposed on it by the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. We could waive that one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the time?

Mr. MUNDT. From 12 to 3.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on the Judiciary may be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that all other committees not be allowed to meet during the period from 12 noon to 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I realize that that is not going to guarantee that every Senator will be in his seat, but it will at least destroy any alibi as to why Senators could not be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Montana if the time to be allowed tomorrow is to be in the usual form?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective on Wednesday, October 25, 1967, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, except amendment No. 419, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on which there shall be 1 hour, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to ½ hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m. on amendment No. 420, offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on which the debate shall commence at 12:30 p.m.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hoped that we will be able to take up some conference reports tomorrow. I am glad to note that there will be one now. There will be no voting tonight.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Breskin, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Sen-

ate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. GAIAMO, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 to the bill and concurred therein; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I make a brief explanation? The distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is chairman of the conferees and is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Independent Offices, is unable to be here, but has asked that we bring up the conference report, which has just been adopted by the House, and to take certain action on it.

I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is the ranking minority member of that committee, and he is agreeable to that course of action.

With that understanding, I ask that the conference report be reported.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, that is the report that involves rent supplements and model cities. I would like to know of the intentions in that respect before I consent to going on with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy to assure my friend that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is not able to be here, completely agreed with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself that, after agreeing to that part of the conference report that is in agreement, we will ask the Senate not to recede from its position in those two matters but to ask for an additional conference on them, and to appoint conferees.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be recognized in the interim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

#### CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in conversations with my colleagues in this body and in the House of Representatives, I have heard certain expressions of reluctance to oppose the Senate-House conference report on redistricting since there is a possibility that without the legislation recommended by the report there would be no effective prohibition against elections at large.

May I, therefore, at this time state my definite intention to introduce, at the appropriate time and to appropriate pending business, an amendment that will immediately and permanently outlaw at-large elections to the House of Representatives from all States that have more than one Representative.

So that my intention may be entirely clear, I shall now read for the RECORD the amendment I propose to offer:

In each State entitled in the Ninety-First Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.

I believe that the proposal in the conference report, if enacted, will be found entirely unconstitutional as an unauthorized invasion of the constitutional jurisdiction of the Federal courts since the report, in effect, attempts to prevent the judiciary from ordering equitable redistricting prior to 1972. Since the conference report carries no severability clause, if the special census provision of the conference report were found unconstitutional, the entire enactment, including that prohibition in the conference report against elections at large, will also be struck down.

If that eventuality, unhappy in its prospects, were to occur, the effect of the conference report would be to unintentionally heighten the possibility that many of the 174 Congressmen from Indiana, California, New York, New Jersey, Texas, Missouri, Ohio, and Florida might have to run at large in 1968.

My amendment is the same as a provision contained in the sound congressional redistricting legislation passed in the Senate on June 3 by the convincing margin of 55 to 28.

I think that both bodies of Congress will readily agree that the amendment

should be dealt with immediately and favorably. No one wants the incredible political distortions that would occur if entire delegations in several major States were forced to run at large.

I believe that my proposal for eliminating at-large elections is preferable to the proposal contained in the conference report because:

First, this proposal will be immediately effective and will not be clouded by doubts of constitutionality as is the conference proposal. Standing alone, an at-large election prohibition is clearly constitutional under article I, section IV, of the Federal Constitution.

Second, this proposal permanently resolves the question; the conference proposal would only eliminate at-large elections in 1968 and 1970.

Third, this proposal applies to all States entitled to more than one representative; the conference report excludes New Mexico and Hawaii from the at-large prohibition.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, once again we may soon have before us proposed legislation dealing with one of the most cherished rights of all Americans, the right to vote. As the Supreme Court said in the Wesberry case:

No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.

And, unfortunately, once again we may be asked to pass upon a congressional districting—or nondistricting—proposal which would undermine the right to vote of millions of American citizens. It is a proposal which proceeds from a fallacious assumption to an unsupportable conclusion. It is a proposal which—though it stems from bills that might have implemented the Constitution's one-man, one-vote principle as articulated by the Supreme Court—would delay and dilute and obstruct the realization of that constitutional mandate. It is a proposal that under the thinnest veneer of superficial order and reason carries a heavy coat of confusion, irrationality, unworkability, conflict, unconstitutionality, and delay, and more delay, and still more delay.

It would be a giant step backward on a road where the House had determined to take a small step forward, and where the Senate, in three separate and convincing votes, expressed its determination to take a major step forward. It would constitute a serious breaking of faith with our sworn duty to preserve and protect both the Constitution of the United States and the interests of the people we represent. It would put Congress in the position of attempting to overturn constitutional decisions of the Supreme Court designed to protect our constituents.

We in the Senate have already rejected a bill far less objectionable than the present one. Moreover, the House in June recommitment a similar conference bill and independent observers said we would have voted to do the same. We passed a reasonable, practical, constitutional,

and forward-looking substitute. It was incumbent on our representatives in conference to seek to preserve the good work of this body; and if they had done so, an acceptable compromise would have resulted. Instead we are faced not with a compromise, but with an imposition—an imposition on the desire of the House conferees to report out some bill; an imposition on the Senate's right to consider that issues which had been foreclosed by both Houses would not be reopened, and that the conference would seek a solution between the positions of the two Houses; an imposition on the State legislatures which are looking to Congress for guidance and assistance; an imposition on the courts who would have to untangle the myriad of webs this bill would spin; and, most of all, an imposition on the American people, who expect Congress to protect their rights, not frustrate them.

We are lawmakers, and we preach obedience to law—law wherever it is found, in the Constitution, in the statute books, and in court decisions. But we must practice what we preach. Neither as individuals nor as legislators can we let our own disagreements with constitutional precepts, legislative utterances, or court interpretations supercede our obligation and oath to abide by these mandates. This is especially so when we exercise our legislative functions.

We are not in a contest of power with the courts. It is our job to write and pass legislation which is clear, clearly constitutional, and solves problems instead of creating them. It is the courts' job to review, interpret, and apply both the Constitution itself and the bills we pass. These are cooperative, coordinate, and consistent functions, rather than competitive and conflicting ones, and we must treat the courts as allies in the law, not antagonists.

Unlike some of its predecessors, the conference bill has almost no redeeming qualities whatsoever. It is a blatant and cynical attack on the Supreme Court, tantamount to a sophisticated act of civil disobedience by people who should, and I believe do, know better.

As Senators may recall, nearly 5 months ago the Senate passed by a vote of 57 to 25 a substitute for the House-passed congressional redistricting bill, H.R. 2508. Our bill provided for immediate vindication of the one-man, one-vote mandate of the Constitution and the Supreme Court by requiring States not now in compliance with that requirement to comply before the next congressional election. It also provided a clear and enforceable proscription against gerrymandering, the pernicious along racial, political, or economic lines.

Our bill was widely hailed as a sensible and true answer to the districting problem. It had the common support of such normally disagreeing newspapers as the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal & Star and the New York Post, and the full backing of citizen groups, labor unions, legal scholars, and thousands of ordinary citizens whose interests it protected.

Our effort was especially important because it relieved Congress of the embarrassment of the House-passed bill.

That was a bill which had had no hearings in either House. It had been rushed through committees on both sides, becoming progressively encumbered with layer upon layer of special interest provisions. While it went into the House with a prohibition against gerrymandering, it came out with an invitation to gerrymandering. It tried to leave to the very institutions—the States—which had been unable to resist the temptation to gerrymander, the responsibility for controlling gerrymandering. It provided temporary guidelines which, while not insignificant, were meager and subject to misunderstanding. The 30 percent cutoff point on population variation was designed by its authors to relieve most States of the constitutional obligation to redistrict, although many who might have tried to take advantage of this would have failed in the end. The Senate committee, without any hearings or basis in fact, attempted to raise the cutoff point to 35 percent.

I detail these factors because they indicate the kind of attitude with which some supporters of the bill have proceeded. One might indeed have thought that the bill's apparent supporters were its worst enemies in view of what they have done to it at every step of the way. They seem to have made it as irrational and irresponsible as the traffic would bear each time they had a chance to change it.

But in any event the Senate was not frightened away by this sort of overreaching, and passed a responsible bill. Six Senate conferees, only one of whom had voted for passage of the bill, were appointed and sent to conference to carry out the Senate's expressed desire "to insist on its amendment."

Unfortunately only one of the six Senate conferees seemed to want to meet this desire. The other five moved almost immediately to adopt bills which not only failed to preserve any of the gains offered by the Senate bill, but actually attempted to turn the House's partial mandate for redistricting in 1968 and 1970 upside down into a practical prohibition against such districting. They succeeded in persuading the House conferees to report such a bill in June, but even the House would not accept that. Now we may be faced with a very similar bill, if the House does not reject the conference report.

Perhaps the incredibility of the bill now before the House can best be understood by an element by element comparison of the principal features of the bills passed by the House and Senate and sent to conference.

Both bills had a permanent maximum deviation between districts of 10 percent. The present proposal has no permanent guidelines whatsoever.

Both Houses addressed the problem of gerrymandering. While the two approaches were different, compromise would have been possible. Yet, the present proposal contains no standards relating to compactness.

The House's temporary provision would have automatically mandated redistricting in all States where the disparity was over 30 percent, and would not have interfered with court-ordered

redistricting in other States. The Senate version automatically required redistricting in States with deviations above 10 percent, but also contained no barrier to court redistrictings. In both versions the population measurements could be based on either the 1960 census or a subsequent special census. Again compromise should have been easily attainable. Redistricting should automatically be required for all States with deviations above some figure between 10 and 30 percent, based on the 1960 census or a special census. The present proposal bears no relationship to either House's version or to any logical compromise. It does not require districting of any States no matter how unequal their districts. In the contrary it purports to preclude redistricting, possibly even where there are existing court orders based on the Constitution, unless the results of a special Federal census are available.

Whatever the rules of the Senate and House may technically permit conferees to do under the circumstances relevant here, the spirit of these rules must require some respect for the will of both Houses of Congress. There are precedents for achieving appointment of specifically committed conferees, but this kind of formal arrangement should not be necessary among men of good will. Yet if this is so, how can we explain a conference bill which requires no State to redistrict now when both Houses required at least those over 30 percent to do so; which interferes with use of the 1960 census when both Houses approved its use; which has no permanent standards when both Houses had permanent standards.

I do not think we need the answer now to proceed with the task at hand. With a quick look at the substance of the conference bill, we can see that it has no rationale and no virtues, and thus we can, and must, reject it out of hand.

The conference bill is unclear, unwarranted, unenforceable, and unconstitutional. Its most objectionable and invalid provision says that no State shall be required to redistrict unless it has the results of a special Federal census available. The theory of this limitation is that the 1960 census is unusable.

The fact is that there is no need for any such provision. The courts and the States themselves have repeatedly used the 1960 data to comply with the existing Supreme Court standards over the past 3½ years, and there was no evidence before either House that this has caused any problems—certainly not anything like the inequities caused by the disparities in many States' present districts.

Both Houses of Congress specifically found the 1960 data acceptable. And rightly so. This is the data we use for apportioning congressional seats among the States. And this is the data which the States would have used to district in a constitutional manner in 1961, if they had done so.

The Nation has traditionally been willing to live with the kind of changes which occur solely as a result of population changes between decades, as long as we start the decade with substantial equality. Moreover, it is sheer fantasy to suppose that a State with, say 40-percent de-

viation based on the 1960 census, will have less deviation in current terms than the same State if it had started out with 4-percent deviation on a 1960 basis.

This is especially so since the 1960-based districts can be fixed now with the benefit of hindsight, so that the fastest growing areas can be put in the smallest districts, and declining-population areas in the largest districts. This would mean a significantly decreased variation in current terms for a State which really wanted to do an equitable job.

There is certainly no justification for a blanket rejection of mandated redistrictings based on the 1960 census. First, if there are States which are under court order and can show that good faith use of other reliable figures would clearly produce more equitable districting than use of 1960 figures, the courts would certainly be able to take note of this fact. Second, if States can district voluntarily on the basis of the 1960 census, as this bill permits, under no reasoning can the same census be held inappropriate for the same or other States when they are ordered to redistrict. Third, as was well known to the conferees, in many States it would be impossible to obtain a special census in time for the 1968 primaries; thus the 1960 census is the best, and usually the only, reliable population data available.

As a practical matter, the courts would take one of two courses with this bill. They could simply hold that in any State where the special census is not and will not be available for 1968, the requirement is an unconstitutional interference with the one-man, one-vote principle, and need not be followed. Thus, immediate redistricting could be ordered. Or they might merely void existing districts without ordering any substitute, pending the special census. The State would then have to decide whether to redistrict voluntarily in the meanwhile on the basis of the 1960 census, or choose to have at-large elections until a special census can be conducted.

This is the kind of confusion and conflict the conference bill promises. For lack of perfection in 1960-based districting, it would seek to prevent any movement toward fairer districting. It is irresponsible and unreasonable. It should be shelved and forgotten. While the Senate bill remains as the most effective and useful one proposed, we need not insist that all of its reforms be instituted immediately and fully if this insistence will result in no reform. On the other hand we cannot accept any proposal which—like the conference bill—is far worse than no bill at all.

There were in fact several compromises suggested in conference which seemed most appropriate and logical. They would certainly have been acceptable to me, and also, I believe, to those Members of the Senate who supported the substitute for which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] fought, as well as many of those who did not. At the very least the 90th Congress should be able to agree on a measure which bars at-large elections, and while this appears an inadequate alternative to me, I would not oppose an attempt to adopt it.



Our constituents are depending on us to vindicate their rights to equal representation in Congress. The judges and State legislatures and State executives are hoping that we will relieve them of the shadow of doubt and debate which would hang over them under the conference bill. And we owe it to ourselves to do what is right to secure an undiminished vote for every American. Again, in the words of Wesberry:

That is the high standard of justice and common sense which the Founders set for us.

#### JAMES R. HOFFA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, at some date, I believe during last April, Mr. William Loeb, a newspaper publisher in my State and an old personal friend, brought Mrs. Hoffa, wife of the Teamsters' president confined at the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, to my office. Knowing Mr. Loeb to be a sincere and ardent supporter of Mr. Hoffa and a believer in his innocence, I rather anticipated a request for some sort of cooperation in the matter of Hoffa's appeal case, which was then pending.

Somewhat to my surprise, the request that Mrs. Hoffa made was a very simple one. She wanted me to intercede in her behalf and ask that her spiritual adviser, Msgr. W. Joyce Russell, be placed on the list of those allowed to visit Mr. Hoffa in prison. This seemed to me to be a very reasonable request, and I gladly consented to make it for her.

Accordingly, on April 25, I addressed a letter to the Attorney General asking that permission be given. Frankly, I anticipated no difficulty and thought it would be granted as a matter of course. To my surprise, I received a reply under date of May 8 from Myrl E. Alexander, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Mr. Alexander's reply be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1967.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,  
The Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been requested to ask that the privilege of visiting Mr. James R. Hoffa, presently confined at the Federal Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, be extended to the Right Reverend Monsignor William Joyce Russell, St. Catherine Laboure Rectory, 11801 Claridge Road, Wheaton, Maryland.

It is my understanding that Monsignor Russell serves as Mrs. Hoffa's spiritual confessor and is anxious to comply with the family's desire that he offer similar comfort to Mr. Hoffa during permitted visitation periods. It is my further understanding that Mr. Hoffa wishes to avail himself of Monsignor Russell's ministrations.

I am sure you will agree that wherever possible inmates of our penal institutions should have reasonable access to and assistance from clergymen of their choice, and I hope you will find it possible to authorize the addition of Monsignor Russell's name for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

NORRIS COTTON,  
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
BUREAU OF PRISONS,  
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

HON. NORRIS COTTON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of April 25. I have given considerable thought to the request that Monsignor Russell be allowed to visit Mr. Hoffa and to act as his spiritual advisor.

It is our policy that persons in our custody should have access to religious counseling and advice from an ordained minister or priest. For this reason, we have full time Protestant and Catholic chaplains at all of our major institutions.

At the United States Penitentiary, Lewisburg, where Mr. Hoffa is confined we have two dedicated young chaplains who are doing an outstanding job. I am certain that either of them would be happy to act as Mr. Hoffa's spiritual advisor, and both are readily available at any time he desires their services.

An ideal situation would exist if we could allow each person in our institutions to have his choice of clergymen from the community but as I am certain you realize, this is administratively impossible.

I can assure you that the staff at Lewisburg will make every effort to fill Mr. Hoffa's spiritual and religious needs. If you would like further information on our religious programs, or if I can be of assistance in any matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MYRL E. ALEXANDER,  
Director.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I read from my letter:

It is my understanding that Monsignor Russell serves as Mrs. Hoffa's spiritual confessor and is anxious to comply with the family's desire that he offer similar comfort to Mr. Hoffa during permitted visitation periods. It is my further understanding that Mr. Hoffa wishes to avail himself of Monsignor Russell's ministrations.

I am sure you will agree that wherever possible inmates of our penal institutions should have reasonable access to and assistance from clergymen of their choice, and I hope you will find it possible to authorize the addition of Monsignor Russell's name for this purpose.

The reply which I received from the Director of Federal Prisons indicated that there were two regular chaplains at the institution and that it was the invariable rule that prisoners in the institutions could avail themselves only of the regular chaplains at the institution and not have the privilege of being visited by clergymen of their choice from outside of the institution.

To say that I was amazed at this response is to put it mildly. I can quite understand that prison authorities would take every precaution to see to it that Mr. Hoffa is not given any privileges not accorded to other prisoners. I can also understand that they might well take special precautions to see to it that Mr. Hoffa would not have such an extended list of visitors that he could in a sense run his union from the prison cell, but certainly a Catholic priest of the rank of Monsignor would not be visiting for any other purpose than to give spiritual advice and consolation. Furthermore, I found it very hard to believe that it could be a fixed and universal rule to forbid prisoners in our Federal institutions the opportunity to receive visits at reason-

able times from reputable clergymen of their choice. Therefore, I took the matter up with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] who is on the Judiciary Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Prisons. He kindly queried the Bureau of Prisons and came up with the same information, that it was an invariable rule to permit prisoners to have spiritual advice only from chaplains assigned to the institution.

In the meantime, it has been reported to me that Monsignor Russell had conferred with a clergyman from a nearby community who also acts as assistant to a full-time chaplain at the prison, and had been advised to desist from any attempts to visit Hoffa, because "this case is loaded with dynamite. We will have to wait until things quiet down." I do not know how much Mr. Hoffa stands in need of spiritual comfort, but it would seem he would obtain little from a chaplain under this kind of pressure.

By this time I had resolved to pursue the matter further. I hold no brief for Mr. Hoffa and have never attempted to examine or form an opinion on the facts of this case. The courts, not the Senate, are charged with this function, and I am sure that Mr. Hoffa is and has been represented by fully competent counsel. As I stated, I believe he should receive exactly the same treatment that every other prisoner receives—no more, no less. I was not prepared to accept, however, the insistence that it was an ironclad rule that prisoners could never receive spiritual attention from any clergyman except the prison chaplains. And I determined to try to ascertain the truth of this assertion.

Naturally, I communicated these facts to Mr. Loeb and suggested that as he was so deeply interested in the case, he might take steps to ascertain the true facts, because my staff is burdened with other matters and I would not have the means to conduct any survey.

On September 28, I received from Mr. Loeb a copy of a report made to him by one of his reporters, Arthur Egan, who had interviewed for 1½ hours the warden of the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn. In the report Mr. Egan quotes the warden as follows:

"We encourage all members of all faiths to come here and work or talk with our inmates, priests, ministers, or rabbis—makes no difference to us—all are welcome," said the warden.

"We do everything we can to assist these people. We, and the entire Federal penal system place great stress on and need for outside religious help. These people are the link between the inmate and the community—they keep the man's faith up, they get down to the grass roots of the situation so to speak."

When I stressed the point the right of a priest was denied, the warden said, "The inmate must be an exceptional inmate, must have committed an exceptional crime."

His report further states:

The warden expressed utter disbelief that any member of any faith was denied the right to visit an inmate in a Federal institution. "Not allowing an outside minister, priest, or rabbi to visit an inmate is contrary to the policy and regulations of the Bureau of Prisons," was the warden's remark when I told

him a Catholic priest was denied the right to see an inmate.

When asked if this was the policy because his institution was a minimum security prison he said it wasn't—that the same policy holds true for all Federal Prisons regardless of security.

Mr. President, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Egan's report, but certainly I have no reason to doubt it. I feel that the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary should investigate further into this matter and seek to ascertain the policy of the Bureau of Prisons with respect to visits by spiritual advisers. I informed the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I intended to speak of this matter on the floor and invited him, if convenient, to be present. I would, of course, welcome any comments he may have to make on any further light he may throw upon this question.

I hope that this matter can be settled, not because it concerns a rather notorious prisoner, but because it would seem in the public interest to know exactly whether this is the policy and, if so, why.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I gladly yield to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire should be commended for the persistence with which he has pursued this matter. I believe the matter illustrates the great variety of situations and inquiries with which Members of the Senate are confronted from time to time.

One of my assignments as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for the last 10 or 12 years has been to be a member of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries; and in pursuing that assignment I have come to have a high regard for the tremendous progress that has been made in the prison system of this country. Under the brilliant leadership of James Bennett, who has retired, tremendous steps have been taken to cover the matter of rehabilitation, of education, of training, and of fitting men, even under a work release program, for reentry into society. There has not been neglected the matter of religious education and the provision for such ministers, rabbis, or priests as might come along.

When the Senator from New Hampshire asked me about this matter, I told him I would be most pleased to inquire into it, because it would be a specific inquiry in an area about which I have made frequent inquiry on my own, in connection with my official duties. So I addressed an inquiry to the present Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Myrl Alexander, and under date of August 3 he replied to my inquiry.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his letter be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. The sum and substance of the reply is that Mr. Hoffa is not being handled in any way inconsistent with the policies and procedures of the Federal

Bureau of Prisons. I have in my hand a copy of the policy memorandum on the subject of religious beliefs and practices of inmates, issued by the Bureau of Prisons on April 6, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent parts of the bulletin bearing upon this subject be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Based upon the text of that policy memorandum and upon the letter, I would say that what Mr. Alexander said in his letter of October 3 is true and correct.

I have not seen the report that Mr. Egan made to the publisher of the newspaper, Mr. Loeb. I do not know its contents.

I would say this, however: It would appear that the warden at the Danbury institution is right—there is resort to the ministers, the rabbis, and the priests of a community in which the institution is located, for the purpose of furnishing a link with the community, and to furnish, also, such religious ministrations as the prisoners might desire when they cannot be supplied within the institution itself. Of that I have personal knowledge. But to import a member of the clergy from one community to a distant institution would open tremendous administrative difficulties in large institutions such as those at Lewisburg, Atlanta, Fort Leavenworth, and others across the country.

I believe that Mr. Alexander has truly spoken. What I should like to do, however, and I offer to do it willingly—again, in line with the duties that have been assigned to me as a member of this subcommittee—is to refer the entire matter, including the Egan report, to Mr. Alexander, and let him comment upon it.

But I do believe that Mr. Hoffa is not being discriminated against, and that he is being handled in a proper fashion in this regard.

All of his spiritual needs are being taken care of that can be taken care of. Perhaps they are not being taken care of on the basis he would like to have it. Maybe the dentist who works on his teeth is not the dentist he would have if he were at large. Maybe the clothes he wears are not the same clothes he would wear. However, that is a part of the price he is paying for having violated certain laws. The matter was litigated and maybe he is a little discommoded, unhappy, and provoked, but that is beside the point. The point is that this is the policy within the prison system, from my inquiry. I would be happy to supply any new material which the Senator from New Hampshire has received and we will see what the judgment of the prison system is on that score.

#### EXHIBIT 1

AUGUST 3, 1967.

HON. ROMAN HRUSKA,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I have your recent inquiry in which you, as a member of the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee, requested information on the visiting privileges accorded Mr. James R. Hoffa at the U.S. Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. I understand that you have been contacted by

another member of the Senate concerning the possibility of a Catholic Priest visiting Mr. Hoffa while he is in our custody.

Since his commitment, Mr. Hoffa has been handled in a manner consistent with our policies and procedures. He is not discriminated against and, by the same token, he receives no privileges which are not accorded to other inmates in the institution.

As you know, it has been our long standing policy that all inmates have access to religious counsel and have the opportunity to worship in accordance with their faith. Consistent with this policy, we have two full-time Chaplains on the staff at the Lewisburg institution, one Protestant and the other, Catholic. Their sole responsibility is to minister to the spiritual needs of the inmate population.

All offenders confined in our institutions are permitted to receive regular visits from members of their immediate family and from attorneys of record. In Mr. Hoffa's situation, he has been receiving regular visits in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Lewisburg institution. As I am certain you can appreciate, it is not possible for us to extend visiting privileges beyond those I have mentioned. To do so, would be administratively impossible due to the limited size of our visiting facilities and the number of inmates confined in our institutions.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to you. If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MYRL E. ALEXANDER,  
Director.

#### EXHIBIT 2

#### 1. POLICY: FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND PRACTICE

a. The objective of the Bureau of Prisons is to extend the greatest amount of freedom and opportunity in this area as is consonant with the total mission of the Bureau. This includes the requirements of maintaining security, safety, and orderly conditions in the institutions and of distributing available resources as wisely as possible among the many kinds of services and activities which contribute to these aims and to the purpose of rehabilitating offenders. To this end we have established these policies.

b. Chaplains employed by the Bureau are available to serve all inmates, assisting them to deepen and expand their knowledge, understanding and commitment to the beliefs and principles of the religion of their choice and to resolve such personal conflicts as they may have relative to religious beliefs.

c. Achieving these purposes may, and at times should, entail utilization of resources beyond those normally available within the institution, including clergymen or other representatives of churches in the community.

We recognize the fact that members of some religious faiths have special needs which cannot be met by the services of the institutional chaplain. For example, there are some Protestant denominations in which there are special requirements surrounding the administration of the Sacraments, Jewish inmates, members of the Church of Jesus Christ and the Latter Day Saints, Jehovah's Witnesses, and others also have special religious needs.

The chaplains are responsible for coordination of all religious services. When inmate request shows the need for such denominational activity, the chaplain may, with the approval of the Warden, provide contract coverage from the local community, or as suggested by the appropriate administrative office of the denomination involved. Such special denominational activities shall be scheduled at a time when the institution can provide adequate staff supervision. Serv-



ices conducted by a regularly appointed chaplain, contract chaplain, or approved civilian religious leader shall be open to the general population, with consent of the religious leader involved. Where religious groups with special needs are without the services of a visiting clergyman, they may, on recommendation of the chaplain and with approval of the Warden, be permitted to meet for religious activities under supervision of a staff member. Inmate conducted religious activities are not open to the general population, but shall be limited to bona fide members of the group holding the service. Under no circumstances will members of a religious group be permitted to proselytize members within the institution population.

e. The policy of augmenting usual religious services does not contemplate the admission of clergymen to conduct worship services except on invitation of the chaplains pursuant to the policies set forth above.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his very courteous, thorough, and enlightening explanation of the situation. I know my friend from Nebraska and the other members of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary and I feel sure and I hope they will give this matter a fairly thorough investigation, and not because Mr. Hoffa or other individuals are involved. However this is a point upon which I am sure—and this in no way reflects upon my confidence in the Senator from Nebraska, as there is no Senator in whose sincerity and directness we could have greater confidence—a renewed inquiry to Mr. Alexander is not going to resolve the question.

I have a distinct feeling, having known Mr. Bennett in the years of his very constructive service as the Director of Prisons, that had he been the Director of Prisons and I had written him a letter merely requesting that a Catholic priest be allowed to visit the prisoner, I doubt very much if I would have received the same kind of reply.

It was indicated in Mr. Alexander's response to me that he was only—and I repeat the word "only"—entitled to ministrations of the regular chaplains in the prison. Now, in his subsequent communication to my good friend from Nebraska he seems to draw a regional line and to be saying that they do permit outside clergymen to come in, but only from adjoining, contiguous, or fairly nearby communities. I cannot quite see the point in that. There is no suggestion that a priest from a distant community or the home community of the prisoner be transported to the penitentiary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I fear that I must have created the wrong impression or given the wrong statement in respect to this policy memorandum and also with reference to the use of members of the clergy from the area around the institution where the prison is located. It is not that way. Wherever there is a need for them, they come from that community. It is not in every case that they can come in. There are regulations and the text of some of the regulations I have

inserted in the RECORD show that to be the case.

Obviously, if there is a full-time Catholic priest in the institution, as there is in Lewisburg, Pa., there is no call for any additional personal services at the hands of another priest, certainly not unless there are so many in the prison he would not have time to minister to all of them. That is one of the things borne out in the policy memorandum, and I understand it is the policy of long standing, even under James Bennett, the longtime administrator of the prison system.

If I did mislead the Senator from New Hampshire I am sorry, but I think that a perusal of this policy memorandum will clear the matter up in this regard.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are holding up the proceedings of the Senate and I do not want to prolong the matter. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his comment. He was kind enough to show me, just a moment ago, the provision in a memorandum of policy, as I understood it—not a regulation.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is entitled, "Policy Memorandum."

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. It is a policy memorandum which, to me, is somewhat different than rules and regulations adopted for the administration of Federal prisons. It is a statement of policy. Apparently, as I read it, it indicates that there is a distinction drawn between permitting a clergyman to come in from the immediate vicinity as opposed to one coming in from a distance. Perhaps in many cases they make use of persons residing in the community. Again, I repeat, I hold no brief for Mr. Hoffa as an individual, but in this matter of permitting a priest, who ministered to his family, having the opportunity to see him, that situation certainly is not similar to the dentist who works on his teeth. It is not quite the same as the kind of haircut one gets in prison. It is not in any manner similar to the style or quality clothes they wear.

Mr. President, it has been my impression—and not in connection with Federal institutions, of which I know little—that in many State institutions it is the policy to encourage, and unless it became a nuisance and the visits were so frequent as to interfere with the prison regime and discipline, to welcome the work that would be done by a clergyman of a person's choice in rehabilitating and assisting that prisoner. I still think that is the right policy. I am not convinced it has not been, to some extent at least and within reasonable restrictions, the policy in Federal prisons.

I again express the hope that the subcommittee will look into this matter rather carefully in order that the principle may be clearly established.

I apologize to my friends on the committee who have this conference report for taking the time, and again I thank the Senator from Nebraska who has been most cooperative.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, by agreement between the acting leaders of

the majority and minority, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the conference report is signed by all conferees of both Houses. I regret to report that the conferees are not in agreement on all items in conference. I ask first that the conference report be approved, and I want to say that the savings made by the conference report up to this time, without considering matters which will be left to be determined in subsequent conferences, is something in the neighborhood of \$500 million below the President's budget.

I shall ask for adoption of the conference report, but first yield to my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator, of course, is right. I think it is proper to call attention to this matter and also to state at this time that it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Florida, with my full consent, after adoption of the conference report, to send back to conference the items in disagreement. That is our intention at the present time.

That is all I have to say at this moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the joint intention, Mr. President. We have assured one of our distinguished friends, very much interested in this matter—he has now come into the Chamber, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]—that it is our intention to insist on the Senate amendments that deal with model cities and rent supplements.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his customary courtesy in giving me notice.

Mr. President, I shall not take myself as an example, but will take the members of the Appropriations Committee on the hardheaded way in which they worked on this problem. In spite of the tremendous difficulties faced by our cities today, they came to the conclusion that both programs were eminently justified.

I realize the problem of budget cutting going on in the other body, but with all respect, they are completely indiscriminate and the President is greatly at fault in not giving Congress his concept of the order of priorities. I shall be arguing that point on tomorrow's question of the continuing resolution,

but I am mentioning it now because I appreciate the feeling of the conferees in view of the considered judgment of the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee is certainly not likely to go wild on the so-called liberal side, but this was a hardheaded consideration and they came to the conclusion that it is justified.

I greatly appreciate the attitude of the conferees, who stood by that finding of the committee in the Senate today, as to what humanly can be done with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to say, without any variance at all, that all the conferees on the Senate side stood by the Senate action on the two highly controversial items, model cities and rent supplements.

There has been no weakness or yielding on the part of Senate conferees. The items were reported in disagreement. The House stood by its position. We shall, of course, after adoption of the conference report, insist upon those amendments on these two matters and we shall ask for a further conference in the other body and for the appointment of Senate conferees on these two items.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is one amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,000,000".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. There is a split between the two amounts. It is now our duty, under what was agreed in conference, to agree to this particular amendment of the House.

Mr. President, in Senate amendment No. 3, we are not going into detail but I think it will be necessary and I move now that the Senate do agree to the amendment of the House just adopted to Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that the RECORD will contain an explanation. I think that Senators should be able to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Now, Mr. President, we come to the three amendments which are in actual disagreement and I ask that they be considered en bloc, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the three amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the aforesaid bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I state again that these are the three amendments, two of which deal with the model

cities program as handled in the Senate bill, and the other with the rent supplements.

I now move that the Senate insist on its amendments No. 58, and 59, which deal with the model cities program, and No. 67, which deals with the rent supplement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on these three amendments and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

### WELL DONE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe that our administration deserves a "well done," in connection with the restraint and fairness with which it handled the peace demonstration of this past weekend. Just as I salute the bravery of our soldiers in Vietnam, so I salute the restraint of the young soldiers at the Pentagon this past weekend.

I wonder, too, what other great nation could permit such a massive demonstration to occur—and where, if it occurred, so little violence or mayhem would have accompanied it. Press reports indicate that not a shot was fired, and not a single individual was hospitalized for more than a day or for major injuries.

Certainly such a demonstration could not have occurred in Russia, or China, or North Vietnam. I rejoice that the freedom of our institutions and the restraint of our Government are such that it could take place in our own great country.

### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD AFTER THE PRAYER AND APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the prayer and approval of the Journal, the able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 12 noon.

### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 24, 1967:

### ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Frank W. Lehan, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation (new position).

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 24, 1967:

### IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning John F. L. Ghiardi, of Michigan, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Miss Mary Eileen Welch, of California, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1967; and

The nominations beginning J. Wesley Adams, Jr., of Illinois, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, and ending, Daniel E. Zellmer, of Missouri, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1967.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Chaim Z. Rozwaski, First Hebrew Congregation, Peekskill, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Heavenly Father, Thou sustainest daily in Thy kindness the works of creation and guidest the destiny of man and nations.

Once more Thy servants of this great and noble House gather to deliberate the way to discharge their responsibilities.

Grant them the courage to match their actions with their words, the wisdom to perceive the needs of their people at home, and the ability to fulfill them with honor and compassion.

Give them understanding to grasp the meaning emanant in the historical foundations and role of the United States of America. Shower upon them the wisdom to reach decisions that will preserve this Nation as a fortress of humanity, freedom, and dignity and make it an example unto all the nations of the world. Enlighten their minds to discern what are the fleeting and the firm interests and values of our society so that this decade of ideological and moral convulsions should come to an end. Grant them the resolve to stand by the highest office in the land in this time of trial and preserve it as a tower of national resolution and unity in the face of spreading discord and discontent.

In this age of international crisis of conscience, the eyes of the world look toward this House for leadership, and the hope of mankind rests upon the daily actions taken here. May it be Thy will that these hopes will be sustained and the deliberations and undertakings of this House will be guided and blessed by Thy divine grace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.



## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE IN RE WILKINSON VERSUS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.  
Re civil action file No. 2643-1967.  
The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives

DEAR SIR: By this letter I am transmitting to you a summons in a civil action directed against the United States of America and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I was served with this petition on the 17th of October by a Deputy United States Marshal. In addition to notifying you of this action in accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 a copy of this summons is being forwarded to the U.S. District Attorney for the District of Columbia. In accordance with the provisions of this statute I am requesting the U.S. District Attorney to enter an appearance, file an answer and defend this civil action. Additionally I am notifying the Attorney General of the United States that this suit has been filed against me in my official capacity as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Copies of these letters and notification are attached hereto.

This summons is attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the summons and pleadings will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The documents are as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

(Summons in a civil action—Civil action file No. 2643-1967)

ODESSA WILKINSON, GUARDIAN OF VEEDA KAYE WILKINSON, PLAINTIFF, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEFENDANT

To the above named defendant, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Cobb, Howard, Hayes & Windsor, George H. Windsor, plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 613 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C., an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 60 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief described in the complaint.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,  
Clerk of Court.  
MARY B. DEEVERS,  
Deputy Clerk.

Date: October 13, 1967.

NOTE:—This summons is issued pursuant

to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

ODESSA WILKINSON, GUARDIAN OF VEEDA KAYE WILKINSON, 819 MADISON STREET, NW., WASHINGTON, D.C., PLAINTIFF, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION No. 2643-1967

COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY DEATH BENEFITS

1. This Court has jurisdiction to grant the relief sought under United States Code, Title 28, Sections 1346(a) (2), 2201 and 2203.

2. The plaintiff is an adult citizen of the United States residing in the District of Columbia. She is suing in her representative capacity as the duly appointed, qualified and acting guardian of her minor daughter, Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, in Guardianship No. 13,783 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. She is not suing in her individual capacity as she was divorced from Roy P. Wilkinson, deceased, in Civil Action No. 3151-55 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

3. The United States Government is named as a defendant because the plaintiff seeks an adjudication that she has a right to the payment of funds from the Treasury of the United States.

4. The Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is being sued in his official capacity under Rule 25(d) (2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, minor, is the daughter of Roy P. Wilkinson, who died March 18, 1965 a resident of the District of Columbia. She resides with her mother, the plaintiff, in the District of Columbia. Prior to the death of her father, Roy P. Wilkinson, she was being supported by him pursuant to Order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in Civil Action No. 3151-55. The said Veeda Kaye Wilkinson is the sole heir at law and next of kin of the said Roy P. Wilkinson under applicable law of the District of Columbia.

6. The aforesaid decedent, Roy P. Wilkinson, for many years prior to his death and at the time of his death was employed by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and upon his death his heirs at law and next of kin became entitled to the payment of a monetary benefit under United States Code, Title 2, Section 125, 1965 Supplement.

7. Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, aforesaid, upon the death of her father, Roy P. Wilkinson, was his sole heir at law and next of kin became entitled to the statutory benefit above referred to in paragraph 6.

8. Plaintiff, as guardian and on behalf of Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, has made several demands upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for payment of said benefit, which demands have been refused.

9. The refusal of the Clerk, as aforesaid, to make payment to the plaintiff, as guardian of Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, of the aforesaid statutory benefit is wrongful, arbitrary and capricious, and without proper regard for the rights of the minor child, Veeda Kaye Wilkinson, and the legal responsibility of the defendant Clerk to act rationally and responsibly in paying such statutory benefits.

Wherefore, the promises considered, the plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment declaring that Veeda Kaye Wilkinson is entitled to the payment of the statutory benefit above referred to in paragraph 6 as the sole heir at law and next of kin of Roy P. Wilkinson, deceased, and for such other and further relief as to the Court may appear appropriate.

Cobb, Howard, Hayes & Windsor, Attorneys at Law, 613 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.  
By: GEORGE H. WINDSOR.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Re civil action file No. 2643-1967.

HON. DAVID G. BRESS,  
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,  
U.S. Courthouse, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRESS: I am sending you a copy of a summons in a civil action that was served on me in my official capacity as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. This service was accomplished on October 17 by a Deputy U.S. Marshal.

In accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 I respectfully request that you enter an appearance, file an answer or take such other action as you may deem necessary in defense of this suit against the United States of America and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

This office will assist you in any way possible in preparation of your answer and defense. If you have any questions regarding this matter or if you need additional information please contact my legal advisor, Mr. Bill Hollowell.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

Re civil action file No. 2643-1967.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I am sending you a copy of a summons in a civil action filed against the United States of America and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I was served with this summons on October 17 by a Deputy U.S. Marshal.

In accordance with 2 U.S. Code 118 I have sent a copy of this action to the U.S. District Attorney for the District of Columbia requesting that he enter an appearance and defend this action. Realizing that the defense of this action will be conducted under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General I am also sending you a copy of the summons as well as a copy of the letter that I am forwarding to the U.S. District Attorney.

Respectfully submitted.

W. PAT JENNINGS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

## RABBI CHAIM ROZWASKI

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was our privilege to have the invocation delivered this morning by one of my constituents and a good friend, Rabbi Chaim Rozwaski, spiritual leader of the First Hebrew Congregation of Peekskill, N.Y.

Rabbi Rozwaski, a graduate of Roosevelt and Purdue Universities and the Hebrew Theological College, is a leader in his community and in Westchester County. Among his many community activities he is presently serving as the president of the Peekskill Area Pastors' Association and as chairman of the Northern Westchester Board of Rabbis.

I am very happy that Rabbi Rozwaski

was able to join us today and thank our Chaplain, Dr. Latch, for affording him this opportunity.

So that our colleagues may be better acquainted with Rabbi Rozwaski, I insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a copy of his curriculum vitae:

**A BRIEF CURRICULUM VITAE OF RABBI  
CHAIM ROZWASKI  
OCCUPATION**

Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation of Peekskill, 1821 East Main Street, Peekskill, N.Y.

**EDUCATION**

A. Hebrew: Ordination, Hebrew Theological College; B.H.L., Hebrew Theological College; Certificate, Hebrew University, Jerusalem Maimonides College; Graduate work, Jewish philosophy at Hebrew Theological College.

B. Secular: B.A., Roosevelt University; M. Sc., Purdue University; 45 postgraduate hours in philosophy and sociology.

C. Publications: Contributed articles to various Jewish national magazines and yearbooks.

D. Public appearances: Lectured at Hillel Foundation and Adult Education Forums; appeared on the radio in own regular weekly program as well as panelist and guest speaker.

E. Public positions:

1. President, Peekskill Area Pastors' Association.
  2. Chairman, Northern Westchester Board of Rabbis.
  3. Vice president, Eastern Regional Rabbinical Alumni Association, Hebrew Theological College.
  4. Secretary, Eastern Seaboard Alumni Association, Jewish University of America.
  5. Chaplain, Cortlandt Civil Defense.
  6. Cochairman, Publication Committee of the Rabbinical Council of America.
  7. Member, New York Board of Rabbis.
  8. Held various other public positions in the past.
- F. Marital status: Married and the father of four sons.

**PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE  
REPORT ON H.R. 10345—APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS  
OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE,  
THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES, 1968**

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE  
REPORT ON H.R. 11641—PUBLIC  
WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY  
COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS,  
1968**

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11641, making appropriations for public works and the Atomic Energy

Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**THE NEWEST DEMONSTRATION**

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the newest demonstration, held in Washington in protest of the war, was a comparatively mild affair. Undoubtedly this was due in large part to the fact that adequate preparations were made to preserve law and order and the marchers were well alerted to this fact. Very probably the same results could have been obtained in other cities where rioters created a living hell for decent, law-abiding Americans, if Federal, State, and city officials had made it plain in advance that they intended to uphold the law of the land.

It had been anticipated that the Washington demonstration would draw 200,000 protesters. Only 55,000 participated. Six hundred of these were arrested for getting out of line and this show of force caused the whole affair to disintegrate rapidly.

The fact remains that the demonstration showed that too many Americans are willing to let themselves be used by professional agitators. America has been forced to witness another example of the way that freedom can be abused. It is to be hoped that this fiasco is not accepted by Ho Chi Minh as a true expression of American sentiment, for these antics of the lunatic fringe should not be the means by which the war is prolonged. Toleration at home of these demonstrations can cost the lives of additional American fighting men in Vietnam and the life of one American fighting man should be worth more than all the spectacles of all the protesters in the Nation.

**AN INEQUITY IN THE MILITARY  
SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW**

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House a restriction in the military selective service law which is absolutely contrary to the fundamental concept of the national effort to halt high school dropouts. In fact, this provision of the law, which probably escaped the attention of the Congress, actually creates dropouts, not to mention the fact that it is highly discriminatory.

Under existing law, a young man attending high school who reaches his 20th birthday may be pulled right out of school by the draft board, even though his academic work is satisfactory and regardless of the reason for his being behind the rest of his class in age.

I might point out one instance of a young man who came here, the son of immigrant parents from Italy, who did not start school until he was 9 years of age because of the language barrier. He is a good student. He has received an induction notice for November 3, notwithstanding the fact that his academic record is good.

On the other hand, there are many cases where young men have dropped out of school and been recruited by the poverty program for the Job Corps and subsequently put into apprenticeship programs wherein they are deferrable.

So we have a law which actually caters to the voluntary dropout, on the one hand, and frequently produces an involuntary dropout on the other. It is incongruous, it is inequitable, and it demands correction.

**PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be absent yesterday while in my district on official business, and I missed responding to rollcall No. 333. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 23, 1967, it was necessary for me to be in Florida.

Had I been present on rollcall No. 333, final passage of H.R. 11627 which authorized the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland. I would have voted in the affirmative.

**PROPOSED INTIMIDATION AN IN-  
SULT TO THE CONGRESS**

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have read in this morning's paper that a proposal has been put forward by Martin Luther King that if the Congress does not pass on certain legislation as proposed by certain groups, demonstrations will be used to interrupt the work of Congress in order to pressure the Congress.



I think this city and this Nation have seen enough of these demonstrations. I consider it an insult to the Congress that any man would think the Congress can be intimidated by such threats.

The legislation which comes before the Congress will be, and should be, considered on its merits.

The fact that civil disobedience is involved in this intimidation only makes such a statement more repugnant to me personally, and I think my colleagues feel the same way.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 334]

Ashley	Gibbons	Philbin
Aspinall	Griffiths	Poage
Bell	Hanna	Rarick
Boggs	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Herlong	Resnick
Brown, Calif.	Hollifield	Roybal
Button	Jones, Mo.	St. Onge
Corman	Kleppe	Smith, N.Y.
Dent	Kyl	Utt
Diggs	Long, La.	Williams, Miss.
Flood	McCulloch	Willis
Ford	Macdonald	Wright
William D.	Mass.	
Fountain	Mathias, Md.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

### INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 803)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) "making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 9, 12, 16, 26, 27, 30, 31, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 64, 66, 70, and 76.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 13, 24, 28, 32, 33, 41, 43, 46, 62, 65, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 77, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,983,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including funding of Interagency Boards of Examiners,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

#### "COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL "Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', \$25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$260,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$63,757,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Federal office building (substructure), Seattle, Washington, \$4,500,000; and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$68,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$23,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of two aircraft,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 58, 59, and 67.

JOE L. EVINS,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,

ROBERT N. GIAIMO,

JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,

DAVID PRYOR,

GEORGE MAHON,

CHARLES R. JONAS

(except amendments

Nos. 43, 44, and 71

through 76),

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

(except amendments

Nos. 43, 44, and 71

through 76),

LOUIS C. WYMAN

(except amendments

Nos. 43, 44, and 71

through 76),

BURT L. TALCOTT

(except amendments

Nos. 43, 44, and 71

through 76),

FRANK T. BOW

(except amendments

Nos. 43, 44, and 71

through 76),

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,

JOHN O. PASTORE,

GORDON ALLOTT,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

#### TITLE I

##### Office of Emergency Planning

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$4,700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$4,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$1,450,000

as proposed by the House and \$1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### President's Commission on Postal Organization

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$1,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Funds appropriated to the President

###### Disaster Relief

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for disaster relief instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The full extent of damage in recent hurricanes is not known.

###### Independent offices

###### Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$8,983,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$8,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,066,000 as proposed by the Senate.

###### Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriate \$36,000,000 for salaries and expenses, including funding of interagency boards of examiners, instead of \$23,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,033,000 as proposed by the Senate specifically earmarking \$14,614,000 for interagency boards of examiners.

Amendment No. 9: Restores limitation of \$700,000 as proposed by the House on the amount that may be used for investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations.

##### Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate. The Commission is expected to complete its activities with this additional amount.

##### Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$19,100,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$19,000,000 as proposed by the House.

##### Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$14,220,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$14,445,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$15,150,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

##### General Services Administration

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$260,500,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service instead of \$260,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$261,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$63,757,900 for construction of public buildings projects instead of \$54,511,900 as proposed by the House and \$70,641,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes Senate proposal to authorize \$5,784,000 for a Federal office building, Mobile, Alabama.

Amendments Nos. 17 through 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to concur in amendments of the Senate increasing amounts authorized for certain previously funded and approved projects.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes "and" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Authorizes \$4,500,000 for Federal office building substructure,

Seattle, Washington, as proposed by the Senate, and adds the word "and".

Amendment No. 26: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$1,100,000 for a United States Tax Court Building (substructure).

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$20,285,000 for sites and expenses for public buildings projects as proposed by the House instead of \$21,074,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for expenses, United States Court facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$68,500,000 for operating expenses, Federal Supply Service instead of \$67,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$69,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$350,000 for National Historical Publications Grants as proposed by the House instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$100,000 for the working capital fund.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33: Strike out language proposed by the House and insert language proposed by the Senate relating to approvals required for lease construction projects, as proposed by the Senate.

##### Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$23,460,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$23,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36: Authorize the purchase of two and operation and maintenance of three aircraft instead of the purchase of three and operation and maintenance of four aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$495,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$505,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$17,350,000 as proposed by the House for salaries and expenses instead of \$17,445,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$13,975,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of \$13,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$45,850,000 for medical and prosthetic research instead of \$45,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,458,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriate \$52,600,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$52,000,000 as proposed by the House; and delete the language proposed by the Senate earmarking \$600,000 for a specific project.

Amendment No. 43: Authorizes the issue of \$850,000,000 of beneficial interests or participations in loan assets as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$665,000 for payment of sales insufficiencies instead of \$333,882 as proposed by the House and \$946,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Department of Defense

###### Civil Defense

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for research, shelter survey and marking as proposed by the House instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Deletes House language relating to construction of fallout shelters as proposed by the Senate.



*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

*Emergency Health Activities*

Amendment No. 47: Restores House language and appropriates \$9,000,000 to carry out emergency health activities of the Public Health Service and deletes Senate language to appropriate \$9,426,000 for emergency health and welfare activities.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development*

Amendment No. 48: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$1,000,000 for Alaska housing.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$30,000,000 for grants for neighborhood facilities instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$31,950,000 for salaries and expenses, Renewal and Housing Assistance as proposed by the House instead of \$32,773,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for housing for the elderly or handicapped fund instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$45,000,000 for urban planning grants instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House for open space land programs instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Restore House language limiting grants for open space land programs to 50 percent of cost, and delete Senate language excepting not to exceed \$1,000,000 from such limitation.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$6,100,000 for salaries and expenses, Metropolitan Development, as proposed by the House instead of \$6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$175,000,000 for urban mass transportation grants as proposed by the House instead of \$205,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates \$2,200,000 for urban information and technical assistance instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$3,000,000 for community development training programs instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$500,000 for fellowships for city planning and urban studies.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$10,000,000 for urban research and technology instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Appropriate \$1,850,000 as proposed by the House for salaries and expenses, Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations, instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfer \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to metropolitan expeditors and the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$1,100,000 for administrative expenses of the rent supplement program instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for general administration instead of

\$3,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,230,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$5,300,000 for regional management and services as proposed by the House instead of \$5,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 through 75: Provide participation sales authorizations of not to exceed \$2,385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$581,000,000 as proposed by the House in not to exceed the following principal amounts: \$80,000,000 in the public facility loan fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House; \$1,600,000,000 in the college housing loan fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House; \$250,000,000 in FNMA special assistance functions as proposed by the Senate; and \$355,000,000 in FNMA management and liquidation functions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$131,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$23,000,000 for payment of participation sales insufficiencies as proposed by the House instead of \$42,115,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Strikes out House language relating to transfers to a working capital fund as proposed by the Senate.

JOE L. EVINS,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,

ROBERT N. GIAIMO,

JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,

DAVID PRYOR,

GEORGE MAHON,

CHARLES R. JONAS (except

amendments Nos. 43, 44,

and 71 through 76),

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL (except

amendments Nos. 43,

44, and 71 through 76),

LOUIS C. WYMAN (except

amendments Nos. 43, 44,

and 71 through 76),

BURT L. TALCOTT (except

amendments Nos. 43, 44,

and 71 through 76),

FRANK T. BOW (except

amendments Nos. 43, 44,

and 71 through 76),

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we present this report on the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for 1968. This is a good bill, it is an important bill, and it has been carefully considered in the House and in the Senate. This bill contains appropriations of \$10,064,173,000. We have made reductions that total more than \$756 million below the budget estimates. This is a cut and reduction of more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. The conference bill is \$450,357,000 below the amount approved in the other body.

We have been able to prevail in conference for almost a half billion dollars in cuts. There were 77 items in disagreement. We have reached agreement on all except two programs—the model cities and the rent supplement programs. I hope we will adopt the conference report, and then we can have separate votes on these two programs which we are bringing back to the House in disagreement.

The House conferees prevailed on about 75 percent of the dollar amounts of difference between the two bodies. We believe we have done a good job, and we

believe we are bringing a good conference report back.

The Senate receded on \$150,357,000 in increases, and the House on only \$51 million. We hope the House will sustain the conference report. That will give us an opportunity to work out the two remaining amendments in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, we have reached settlements favorable for the House to the extent of about 75 percent. If the House sustains the position on the two items on which we are in disagreement, the favorable ratio for the House position will be 90 percent. We believe this is a signal victory on a major appropriation bill.

As I have indicated, there were 77 items of disagreement in conference. The Senate receded on 25 items. The House receded on only 17, and the Senate agreed to reductions on 24 other items. Thus the Senate either receded or agreed to reductions on a total of 49 of the 77 items in conference.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that we won in the conference in a very substantial way.

As Members will recall, the House considered the model cities program on May 17th. The House approved the model cities concept at that time in a very modest amount—\$237,000,000.

The Senate bill provides \$537,000,000 for model cities, including the full budgeted amount of \$12,000,000 for planning grants, \$400,000,000 for model cities, and it also includes \$125,000,000 instead of \$250,000,000 as requested for urban renewal projects in model cities. The House felt they could not use all the budget estimate in the first year.

Concerning the rent supplement appropriation, which we will be discussing later, the Committee on Appropriations of the House originally recommended \$10 million of the \$40 million budgeted for the program for 1968. Our subcommittee recommended \$10 million, and the full committee approved the \$10 million. When the matter reached the floor, after full debate, the House rejected the \$10 million on a record vote by a margin of 61 votes.

The Senate has restored the full amount of \$40 million. They strongly favor this program.

As I said earlier, I feel the rent supplement approach is a better approach to meeting the needs of the poor than public housing. We have been in public housing for over 25 years. We are appropriating about \$275 million a year for annual contributions for public housing. The rent supplement approach is a free enterprise approach.

We will discuss this matter further when we consider the items in disagreement later. There have been problems in Detroit and New Haven, and many things have happened in the summer since we considered the bill in May of this year.

Private insurance companies, for example, have recently promised to commit \$1 billion to help improve slum conditions in the ghettos of this Nation. They are counting on the Congress to make some commitment too in this area. They want us to show our good faith. America is watching and waiting for action in this area.

I repeat: we recommended \$10 million in the subcommittee and the full committee, and the House did not approve it. The Senate put in \$40 million. We hope something will be worked out soon to resolve this important issue.

But these are two items we hope to discuss after the conference report is adopted. They are not before the House in this conference report. We hope the conference report will be adopted so that we can get on with the business concerning the other items in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are other items in this important bill and we have made substantial reductions all along the line.

Construction of public buildings is \$61.5 million below last year.

Airline subsidies have been cut and reduced to \$11 million below last year. This reflects the healthy condition in the airline industry and we are all pleased that the airlines are making such good progress.

We have trimmed civil defense \$15 million below 1967.

There are many, many other cuts and reductions in this bill.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness that there are four items in this bill where we are recommending amounts which reflect an increase over the budget—only four. These are all items we feel the House would want us to approve. They are to be compensated for many times over by the many reductions which we have made. We have made a reduction below the budget of over three-quarters of a billion dollars in appropriations.

We are recommending \$25,000 for the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel—the so-called Hatch Act Commission, composed of our colleagues in the House and the Senate. This will allow the Commission to complete their study and report. This is the final amount that will be provided.

We also approved \$6 million as an additional amount for public buildings projects which have previously been

funded and approved. Plans have been drawn and sites have been acquired and appropriations have previously been made. The amount added is necessary in order that bids on some of the projects can be accepted. It is less costly, as the GAO has pointed out, to build these buildings than to lease the equivalent space. If this is delayed longer, and labor and building costs continue to go up, this will increase the ultimate cost of these necessary buildings—to construct them now represents economy. This work should go forward now.

A small increase is provided for the Veterans' Administration program and \$5 million is added for disaster relief. We have had a serious disaster recently, a hurricane in Texas, and there have been other disasters at various places.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, we bring you a conference report which I think is a good one. The House position has been sustained by more than 75 percent. Reductions have been made amounting to more than \$450 million from the amounts approved by the Senate. We think this is a good report and we ask that the conference report be adopted.

I know that my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, has his own views on the participation sales program. This is a budgetary and a Treasury matter. It relates to a matter of financing which has been long recognized and used. A majority of the conferees in the House and the Senate favor these participation sales. There are some Members of the House who had reservations as to the participation sales program. However, only two items are in disagreement—the model cities and the rent supplement programs.

We urge you to adopt the conference report, and then we can discuss these other matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is always interesting to

know how many times the Senate and the House recede in a conference, but when you get to the House floor and you find that a conference report, as in this case, is \$51 million more than the House originally approved, and is some \$400 million, as I understand the figures—and correct me if I am wrong—more than was expended for the same general purposes last year, then you become convinced that there is no economy in this bill and conference report.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In response to my distinguished friend, I would like to suggest that the House passed a new bill of rights for the Vietnam veterans. When that bill was passed it created 4.5 million new veterans and added them to the benefit rolls. A large portion of the increases in the bill are for veterans benefit programs—compensation and pensions, medical care, and readjustment benefits. These are the result of legislation that the House has previously passed. New legislation has been enacted by the Congress in the last 2 years for cities and localities. These are now requiring appropriations which we are funding only in necessary amounts. We made reductions of over three-quarters of a billion dollars in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me this is an awfully good place to start to establish priorities. The gentleman mentioned the veterans. Why not slice the bill in other places where there is less priority and present a bill with some real respect for economy?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend. We have done just what he recommends.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks I include the following comparative statement of the conference action on the bill, reflecting the motions to the House on the items reported in disagreement:

# INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

Item	Appropriations, 1967 <sup>1</sup>	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
National Aeronautics and Space Council								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$525,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000			
Office of Emergency Planning								
Salaries and expenses.....	4,700,000	4,780,000	4,700,000	4,740,000	4,700,000	—\$80,000		—\$40,000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications.....	1,600,000	2,245,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	—300,000		
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....	4,000,000	* (3,688,000)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000		
Total, Office of Emergency Planning.....	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	+2,620,000		—40,000
Office of Science and Technology								
Salaries and expenses.....	1,200,000	1,837,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	1,550,000	—287,000	+\$100,000	—100,000
Total, Executive Office of the President....	12,025,000	9,386,000	11,619,000	11,859,000	11,719,000	+2,333,000	+100,000	—140,000
President's Commission on Postal Organization								
Salaries and expenses.....		* 1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	—500,000	+1,000,000	—500,000

See footnotes at end of table.



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967 <sup>1</sup>	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief.....	\$24,550,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$20,000,000	+\$5,000,000	+\$5,000,000	—\$5,000,000
Alaska mortgage indemnity grants.....	2,600,000							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
Civil Aeronautics Board								
Salaries and expenses.....	12,200,000	9,066,000	8,900,000	9,066,000	8,983,000	—83,000	+83,000	—83,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization).....	63,500,000	54,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	—1,500,000		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	—1,583,000	+83,000	—83,000
Civil Service Commission								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....	22,900,000	38,033,000	23,000,000	38,033,000	36,000,000	—2,033,000	+13,000,000	—2,033,000
By transfer.....	(6,431,000)	(6,129,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(—29,000)		
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations.....	600,000							
Annuities under special acts.....	1,430,000	1,336,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	—36,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits.....	36,644,000		40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	+40,748,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....	73,000,000		71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	+71,000,000		
Payments to trust funds.....		111,748,000				—111,748,000		
Total, Civil Service Commission.....	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	—2,069,000	+13,000,000	—2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel								
Salaries and expenses.....	175,000			25,000	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	17,852,300	19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	—121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,220,000	14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000	—610,000		—225,000
Federal Trade Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	—75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	244,091,000	262,152,000	260,000,000	261,000,000	260,500,000	—1,652,000	+500,000	—500,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings.....	80,000,000	89,800,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	—9,800,000		
Construction, public buildings projects.....	125,318,000	62,545,700	54,511,900	70,641,900	63,757,900	+1,212,200	+9,246,000	—6,884,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	14,132,000	15,276,000	20,285,000	21,074,000	20,285,000	+5,009,000		—789,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	6,746,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities.....	1,500,000	1,640,000	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	—640,000	—175,000	
Additional court facilities.....	6,000,000							
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	65,000,000	70,508,000	67,500,000	69,500,000	68,500,000	—2,008,000	+1,000,000	—1,000,000
Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination.....	500,000							
Automatic data processing fund.....		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000			
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	17,121,000	17,610,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	—30,000		
National historical publications grants.....	350,000	500,000	350,000	500,000	350,000	—150,000		—150,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service.....	5,900,000	6,000,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	—120,000		
Operating expenses, property management and disposal service (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....		(27,440,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(—140,000)		
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(9,000,000)							
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriations of receipts).....	(20,091,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	1,747,000	1,823,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	—76,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation).....	(16,716,000)	(16,699,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(—49,000)		
Working capital fund.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	—100,000		—100,000
General supply fund.....	45,000,000							
Total, General Services Administration.....	613,740,000	540,539,700	521,613,900	541,607,900	532,184,900	—8,354,800	+10,571,000	—9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	—324,000	+60,000	—70,000
Payment of loan guarantees.....	17,400,000							
National Capital Housing Authority								
Operation and maintenance of properties.....	37,000							
National Science Foundation								
Salaries and expenses.....	479,999,000	526,000,000	495,000,000	505,000,000	495,000,000	—31,000,000		—10,000,000
Renegotiation Board								
Salaries and expenses.....	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	—95,000		—95,000

See footnotes at end of table.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued								
Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$800,000							
Selective Service System								
Salaries and expenses.....	58,940,000	\$57,455,000	\$57,455,000	\$57,455,000	\$57,455,000			
Veterans' Administration								
General operating expenses.....	182,437,000	184,342,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	—\$1,121,000		
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	14,312,000	14,300,000	13,650,000	14,300,000	13,975,000	—325,000	+\$325,000	—\$325,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	44,258,000	46,458,000	45,250,000	46,458,000	45,850,000	—608,000	+600,000	—608,000
Medical care.....	1,292,875,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000			
Compensation and pensions.....	4,474,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000			
Readjustment benefits.....	369,400,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000			
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	3,500,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	1,136,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	52,125,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,600,000	52,600,000	+600,000	+600,000	
Grants for construction of State nursing homes.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Participation sales authorization.....	(260,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(850,000,000)		(+550,000,000)	
Payment of sales insufficiencies.....		946,000	333,882	946,000	665,000	—281,000	+331,118	—281,000
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obli- gations).....	(401,750,000)	Language	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(+386,046,000)		
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	—1,735,000	+1,856,118	—1,214,000
Total, Independent Offices.....	7,914,424,300	8,082,296,700	8,010,509,782	8,059,497,900	8,036,354,900	—45,941,800	+25,845,118	—23,143,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
Civil Defense								
Operation and maintenance.....	66,100,000	73,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	—7,000,000		
Research, shelter survey and marking.....	35,000,000	37,900,000	20,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	—17,900,000		—5,000,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense.....	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	—24,900,000		—5,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
Public Health Service								
Emergency health activities.....	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	—3,500,000		—426,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
Renewal and Housing Assistance								
Alaska housing.....		1,000,000		1,000,000		—1,000,000		—1,000,000
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	17,000,000	42,000,000	27,000,000	42,000,000	30,000,000	—12,000,000	+3,000,000	—12,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....		32,773,000	31,950,000	32,773,000	31,950,000	—823,000		—823,000
Urban renewal programs:								
Grants, fiscal year 1968.....	750,000,000							
Grants, fiscal year 1969.....		750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000			
Administrative expenses.....	15,395,000							
Rehabilitation loan fund.....	1,396,000							
Low-rent public housing annual contributions.....	255,000,000	290,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	—15,000,000		
Administrative expenses, public housing programs.....	18,950,000							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.....	80,000,000	80,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000	—55,000,000	+5,000,000	—15,000,000
Total, renewal and housing assistance.....	1,137,741,000	1,195,773,000	1,103,950,000	1,140,773,000	1,111,950,000	—83,823,000	+8,000,000	—28,823,000
Metropolitan Development								
Urban planning grants.....	33,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	—5,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Metropolitan development incentive grants.....		30,000,000				—30,000,000		
Open space land programs.....	55,000,000	125,000,000	75,000,000	100,000,000	75,000,000	—50,000,000		—25,000,000
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.....	100,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000			
Salaries and expenses.....		6,430,000	6,100,000	6,250,000	6,100,000	—330,000		—150,000
Urban transportation activities:								
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1968.....	125,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1969.....		230,000,000	175,000,000	205,000,000	175,000,000	—55,000,000		—30,000,000
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities.....	735,000							
Total, metropolitan development.....	313,735,000	606,430,000	461,100,000	526,250,000	466,100,000	—140,330,000	+5,000,000	—60,150,000
Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations								
Model cities programs.....	11,000,000	662,000,000	237,000,000	537,000,000	237,000,000	—425,000,000	(*)	—300,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance.....		6,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,200,000	—3,800,000	+200,000	—800,000
Community development training programs.....		5,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	—2,000,000	+500,000	—1,500,000
Fellowship for city planning and urban studies.....	(500,000)	500,000		500,000	500,000		+500,000	
Urban studies and housing research.....	500,000							
Urban research and technology.....		20,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	—10,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs.....	1,575,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	—500,000		
Housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards.....	1,500,000							
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....		3,350,000	1,850,000	2,200,000	1,850,000	—1,500,000		—350,000
By transfer.....		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)		(+500,000)	
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations.....	14,575,000	699,350,000	250,350,000	564,200,000	256,550,000	—442,800,000	+6,200,000	—307,650,000

See footnotes at end of table.



## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)—Continued

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1967 <sup>1</sup>	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—Continued								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued								
Mortgage Credit								
Rent supplement program:								
Annual contract authorization.....	(\$20,000,000)	(\$40,000,000)		(\$40,000,000)	(9)	\$ (—\$40,000,000)	(9)	\$ (—\$40,000,000)
Appropriation for payments.....	2,000,000	5,000,000	\$5,000,000	5,000,000	\$5,000,000			
Administrative expenses.....	900,000	1,150,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,100,000	—50,000	+\$100,000	—50,000
Total, mortgage credit.....	2,900,000	6,150,000	6,000,000	6,150,000	6,100,000	—50,000	+100,000	—50,000
Departmental Management								
General administration.....		4,510,000	3,950,000	4,230,000	4,000,000	—510,000	+50,000	—230,000
Regional management and services.....		5,563,000	5,300,000	5,430,000	5,300,000	—263,000		—130,000
Office building equipment and furnishings:								
Appropriation.....	575,000							
By transfer.....	(125,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.....	8,574,000							
Participation sales authorizations.....	(1,420,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(581,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)		(+1,804,000)	
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 42,115,000	23,000,000	42,115,000	23,000,000	—19,115,000		—19,115,000
Working capital fund.....		1,500,000	\$ (1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	—1,500,000		
Total, departmental management.....	17,349,000	53,688,000	32,250,000	51,775,000	32,300,000	—21,388,000	+50,000	—19,475,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,873,000,000	—688,391,000	+19,350,000	—416,148,000
Total appropriations.....	9,550,999,300	10,793,073,700	9,985,878,782	10,487,530,900	10,037,173,900	—755,899,800	+51,295,118	—450,357,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales).....	29,091,000	27,440,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	—140,000		
Grand total.....	9,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,064,473,900	—756,039,800	+51,295,118	—450,357,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.<sup>2</sup> Included in budgets of individual departments and agencies.<sup>3</sup> Contained in S. Doc. 40.<sup>4</sup> Budget amendment in S. Doc. 36 increases by \$14,614,000 for interagency boards, and decreases by \$664,000 for investigations.<sup>5</sup> Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 114.<sup>6</sup> Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.<sup>7</sup> Additional contract authority, beginning July 1, 1967, on urban renewal projects within comprehensive city programs, authorized sec. 113.<sup>8</sup> By transfer.<sup>9</sup> Reported in disagreement. Figures reflect recommendations of House conferees.

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1967 <sup>1</sup>	Budget estimates, 1968 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE II								
CORPORATIONS								
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses.....	(\$4,410,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)	-----	-----	-----
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(13,465,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	-----	-----	-----
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	-----	-----	-----
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
College housing loans.....	(2,089,000)	(2,270,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(-\$70,000)	-----	-----
Housing for the elderly or handicapped.....	(1,232,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(-10,000)	-----	-----
Public facility loans.....	(1,205,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	-----	-----	-----
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	(110,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	-----	-----	-----
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses.....	(10,650,000)	(11,125,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(-125,000)	-----	-----
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(85,000,000)	(88,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(-1,500,000)	-----	-----
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(9,931,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	-----	-----	-----
Total, administrative expenses.....	(128,377,000)	(132,512,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(-1,705,000)	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the managers on the part of the House on this bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], has made a thorough and clear explanation of the contents of this conference report.

I am in general agreement with the gentleman. However, there will be a motion to recommit the conference report, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House, to insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate

amendments numbered 43, 44, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75.

Mr. Speaker, all of these amendments deal with the sale of participating certificates and the subsidies or insufficiencies that are required to make these participations salable.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I endeavored to make clear the fact in my opening statement on the conference report that the rent supplement question as well as the model cities question are not con-

tained in the conference report. These items are outside of the conference report and will come up after the conference report is adopted.

The gentleman from North Carolina is addressing himself to the participation sales, which sales have been approved by a majority of the conferees.

As I understand the gentleman's position, he favored participation sales, up to a specific amount, but the gentleman objected to those sales going to the budget level; is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to give a little background information on the subject. We should all un-

derstand that what is involved here is the difference between the House-approved figures of \$581 million and the figures approved by the other body, \$3,235 million; that is, for the sale of participation certificates.

The total sales authorization—and all of us understand the fact that the law requires Congress through its Committee on Appropriations to authorize the sale of these participating certificates and to fix the level of sales and to provide for the payment of insufficiencies—in the bill that passed here authorized sales of \$881 million in participating certificates in a pool of mortgages that are taken from various programs such as College Housing, Housing for the Elderly, FNMA, and programs operated by the Veterans' Administration.

However, the other body restored the full budget request and granted authority to sell participation up to the sum of \$3,235 million.

So, that is the issue pending before us today and that will be the issue involved in the motion to recommit—shall the House of Representatives sustain its originally taken position?

Mr. Speaker, the reason I think the position of the House should be sustained is simple. It is that the sum of \$881 million is all that is required to finance these ongoing programs during fiscal year 1968. The record is abundantly clear that the administration intends to use the sales or excess proceeds from the sale of these certificates to pay general operating expenses of the Government.

I do not believe that is a sound way to handle the sale of capital assets if, indeed, this is a sale, which it is not. Actually, what it is is a device to borrow money, but it is the most expensive way the Government has of borrowing money today. The extra cost of interest alone will be at least one-half of 1 percent. The total cost of the interest subsidy in 1968, if these authorizations are approved, will amount to \$71 million for the sales that have been made in 1967 and 1968.

Now, this is a recurring and continuing subsidy and the length it continues depends upon the maturity of the sales agreements. They are selling participation certificates now in a range of from 2 years to 20 years and, assuming that 10 years is the average, you can see by multiplying \$71 million by 10 that we will pay out \$710,000,000 in subsidies for the privilege of borrowing money this way. And this is the most expensive way of borrowing money.

Now, if we were selling these mortgages it would be a different thing. If we were doing like they did in the Eisenhower administration, exchanging these mortgages for Government bonds and then canceling the bonds, that would be a different thing. I could support that kind of a deal. Because by doing it that way you would be reducing the national debt, and that is exactly what they did under the Eisenhower administration. What was done then was to exchange mortgages for outstanding bonds that were part of the national debt. They got those bonds in and canceled them. And

this amounted in effect to a reduction in the national debt.

Not only is this the most expensive way of borrowing money, but it is a misuse of capital assets of the United States.

I do not believe we ought to dispose of any interest in capital assets, particularly after having paid such a heavy subsidy in order to get people to buy them, without applying the proceeds on the debt which was partially created by the funds that we used to acquire the mortgages. It is like canceling out your savings and loan account in order to pay your grocery bills. It is like selling a share of stock in order to pay the house rent. You just do not do those things. It is not prudent.

If we were actually going to dispose of our capital assets, and I am in favor of disposing of as many of these mortgages as possible; if we are going to dispose of them, in my judgment, we should not use the proceeds to pay current operating expenses. We ought to use that part of the proceeds that is necessary to finance on-going programs during the year, and the balance ought to be applied as to reduction on the national debt, because otherwise we are disposing of and wasting capital assets and consuming those capital assets in day-to-day living expenses of the Federal Government.

That in brief is my objection to the participation certificates program. That is why—and I point out again that the bill that passed the House in my judgment contains all of the authorizations required to finance on-going programs that these mortgages are applicable to. The balance of about \$2.5 billion of excess money will then go into the Treasury, and will be consumed in day-to-day operations of the Federal Government. I just do not believe that is a sound way to run the Government. That is the reason why I believe the bill ought to be recommitted.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman has a position on this matter—he is opposed to the sale of participation certificates which many of us favor to provide financing for a number of important programs.

In view of the budgetary situation, and to obviate the necessity for increased appropriations, it would seem to me that the gentleman would favor selling certain assets of our Government at this time. We should move some of these frozen assets.

I would say that the gentleman has won two of his points related to the sale of these participation certificates. The law provides that the Congress shall set the limit of participation sales that may be sold through the appropriation process. In conference we have agreed to set the limit on sales at the budget level for 1968. The gentleman wants to go below the budget level on this.

The budget had proposed an indefinite appropriation for insufficiencies. But both the House and Senate bills do not have an indefinite appropriation—there is a definite appropriation.

The gentleman has insisted on having a

line item in the bill for the specific amount of the interest cost. We now have that in the bill and he has won his point with regard to having the interest cost carried in the bill. So we know what the maximum cost will be.

In view of the budgetary situation and the obvious need to move some of these frozen assets and avoid the need to appropriate more funds, I would hope that the gentleman would withdraw his motion to recommit.

Mr. JONAS. I cannot do that but I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee, that I am glad to hear him endorse the line for insufficiencies. If he will think this thing through, I believe he will agree with me that my position with respect to the sales is sound also.

I am in favor of selling what they need to use for these ongoing programs. But I am not in favor of selling additional capital assets and using the money up for their day-to-day operations and expenses.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the President in his budget recommended the sale of \$5 billion worth of participation certificates in 1968. What we are considering in this bill today relates only to sale of participations in assets held by two agencies—the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

If the gentleman wants to vote against programs for the cities and for the veterans, then he should vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. JONAS. I might say in answer to my friend that that is not at issue at all. The motion to recommit would not restrict or curtail the activity of a single one of those agencies. It contemplates the sale of all of the participation certificates expected to be used in 1968.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that in the committee and on the floor of this House that I supported his position in this regard and I still do. I think everything he says is perfectly sound. I would also join him in his last observation that certainly our action here will not in any way curtail the activities of the Veterans' Administration. I think that is a completely erroneous idea.

Furthermore, if the gentleman from North Carolina, as a signer of the conference report, is technically foreclosed from offering the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Illinois, being opposed and not being a signer of the conference report, is prepared to offer the motion to recommit.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished manager of the bill a question as to what the able gentleman from North Carolina just said. The Treasury, over and above the on-going programs, needs this money more than they need the securities which the Government now holds as the basis



for these participation certificates; is that not true?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. This is a recognized financing method. This is a sound concept—the substitution of private credit for public credit. The Treasury Department recommended this, the Bureau of the Budget recommended it and the President has recommended it. The Committee on Appropriations has approved it and the conference committee has approved it.

Mr. ALBERT. Is there not a precedent for this, going back to the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Oh, yes, there is ample precedent—this principle is long established—and it is true that this practice was initiated during a previous administration. It has worked well and this is an extension of the same program. This is a recognized, efficient method of financing.

This program has worked well over the years.

It is a sound concept—based on sound principles of financing.

There is nothing new or novel about this program or this concept.

This type of financing is well accepted in financial circles and by financial institutions.

The participation certificates sales program of the Federal National Mortgage Association has been recommended by the President in his budget, by the Treasury Department and by the Committee on Appropriations.

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 provides a method of utilizing frozen assets which have now accumulated and grown to a total of \$33 billion.

In fiscal 1967 FNMA—as trustee—was able to sell in the private market some \$2.9 billion of participation certificates in loans and mortgages.

These loans and mortgages are owned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Department of Agriculture—the Small Business Administration—and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to substitute private credit for public credit—and this it has done.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to establish a more efficient and orderly method of selling financial assets owned by Federal agencies—and this it has done.

The Participation Sales Act was designed to put the Government's frozen assets to work in the public interest—and this it has done.

And—I must add—this can be done to a greater extent, thereby obviating the necessity for increased appropriations.

This is what is proposed in our report this afternoon.

There have been four major advantages to the use of participation sales.

These are:

First. Cost of the sales—to the Federal Government and to the customer—has been reduced.

Second. The range of the market has

broadened—because participation sales have been more readily accepted.

Third. The impact of the sales has been spread over a broad range in the capital market rather than concentrated in one specialized area—housing mortgage.

Fourth. The net returns have been much greater than could have been achieved through a comparable volume of sales of individual loans.

The alternative to approval of this sound and accepted method of financing is sharp curtailment in needed and necessary loan programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Housing Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer of the gentleman from Tennessee to my question of a moment ago.

The Republicans suggest that there is something novel, something bad about participation certificates. They seem to forget that the Eisenhower administration commenced sales of these types of assets in the 1950's and that the Republicans were the innovators whose innovations have been tested by time and accepted. Now they wish to repudiate this procedure for an overtly partisan reason. Between 1954 and 1960 there were \$3.2 billion worth of sales of assets sold to private investors. They were then called certificates of interest but the principle is the same as participation certificates. These certificates represented interests in the pooled loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The participation certificates of 1967 are being treated under the same accounting procedure that was adopted 12 years ago for certificates of interest.

The sale of these kinds of assets have been publicly supported by Republicans. In 1960, in response to a question concerning sales of assets at a press conference, the then Budget Director Stans said:

I think it is proper business judgment in the Federal Government as in any other enterprise, when you are in that kind of position to look to assets you can liquidate in order to pay your bills. . . . It is like an individual selling off 100 shares of stock in some year in which he has to pay for some operation for his wife.

To the question:

Would you describe it as a bookkeeping device simply to balance the budget?

Mr. Stans replied:

No, sir, I would not. This is a financing means that is employed in this budget.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. In light of the remarks made by the gentleman with reference to the motion to recommit it, a number of us voted against the sale of these participation certificates before. But is it not the case now that with the possibility of a \$29 billion deficit that if we do not sell some of these assets, the Government will have no choice and to the degree that

we do not sell these certificates, it will mean the Government will have to borrow which will result in an increase in the deficit which will probably place pressure on the money market?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is exactly correct.

If we want to improve the budgetary situation, we will vote down the motion to recommit. If we wish to obviate the necessity of increasing appropriations, we will vote down the motion to recommit. Those who are for fiscal responsibility will vote for these participation sales.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that this matter has been placed in a somewhat different position than when it was initially on the floor of the House. It will be recalled, and I am sure my friend from Tennessee remembers, that in consideration of the last debt ceiling, the PC's were placed under that debt ceiling, so that it is no longer a means of financing obligations outside of the debt. That objection has been eliminated.

It is my understanding—and if I am incorrect, correct me—that the conference report comes back to us today with a separate line item for the amount of interest which is involved in the PC sales. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me, then, that another argument has been eliminated. The question now is being advanced that maybe this is a more expensive way to finance borrowing. That may or may not be true. It seems to me that we are facing a situation as we go through the next several months of great uncertainty about what the Government itself will have to pay on its regular Government obligations. We do not know what the price of interest will be as we go down through these next few months.

It may be that through the use of this device, to the extent that we can use it, we can on some occasion, perhaps on all occasions, tend to reduce the effect of what may happen in the money markets as a result of the great rollover that the Treasury has to go through each year on the debt created in prior years. All of us know that there is about \$175 to \$177 billion of the total debt that rolls over every year, and as it has rolled over in the last few years it has become shorter in duration.

We have a limit, as you know, on the interest that can be paid on long-term obligations. In connection with the last debt ceiling bill we also made an exception to that, allowing the Treasury to float bonds without regard to the interest rate for a 7-year period. We are disturbed about the effect of Government borrowing on the money markets, and it is that impact of the Government on the money markets that seems to be causing a lot of people trouble when they go to the money markets. Higher rates are the end result.

I would think that we have answered enough of the arguments about the PC's

to at least allow the executive departments this additional method of coping with the problems that they meet constantly in the money market under these kinds of conditions.

Maybe it would be well for us to figure out some other ways for them to go to the market. But even if this may, as my good friend from North Carolina points out, cost a little more in the long run, the total effect upon the economy may be far less through the use of this than the effect would be without it. I would hope that we could avoid sending this back to conference on this point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman agree that the motion to recommit as to this item should be defeated?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes. I had hoped my friends would not even offer it.

We are playing with a pretty serious thing, as I see it. Most of the Members know my own views about it, but I am concerned, I must say, with the future problems we are going to have in this country in the money markets.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I admire the tenacity and determination of my esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman JONAS from North Carolina. However, in view of the budget situation and the budget proposal, in view of the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendation and the conferees' approving it, and in view of the fact that it involves only two items for the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his motion to recommit the conference report on this point.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield, because I have the greatest respect for my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, but we cannot just go out and pick up the money on the street. We have to go to the money markets for the sale of the PC's just the same as we go to the money market for the sale of bonds. I would point out \$1,600,000,000, of the PC's involved in this are 3-percent notes. The gentleman himself knows we are not going to be able to sell a 3-percent note at anything like par.

Mr. MILLS. This is the reason for the device.

Mr. JONAS. And we are going to have to pay a substantial subsidy for anybody to buy these loans bearing 3 percent interest. I think the RECORD is abundantly clear on the basis of what has transpired so far, that we can count on having to pay at least one-half of 1 percent more for this sort of borrowing than for regular Treasury borrowing.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not disagreeing with my friends about the fact that it is borrowing. I thought I made it plain I am not disagreeing with my friend from North Carolina that it may cost a few points more to go this way than the

other regular way of borrowing. What I am thinking about is whether we know that there is less overall effect with or without this device. That is all I am saying. I think it is worth slightly more in the way of interest cost to have it and to use it if the result of using this vehicle is less depressive and creates less havoc in the marketplaces.

I do not think anybody can say it will or it will not, but I believe as we go forward in this circumstance we need to have this additional vehicle. If this vehicle is useful, if it could avoid some of the problems that regular conventional borrowing would involve and entail, it would be better to go this way.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to make a comment?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield 1 additional minute to my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Arkansas, I am sure, understands I am not trying to eliminate the sale of all PC's. It is just a question of whether we are going to sell the amount of PC's required for the ongoing programs or whether we are going to use this device as a method for borrowing money for ordinary operating expenses of the Government. I just do not happen to believe this is a good way to run the Government.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield, I do not disagree with my good friend about the concern he has about what we should do in normal times. The only thing I am trying to impress upon my friend is that, so far as I can see ahead in the next several months, when it comes to the money markets we are not going to be going through normal times. It seems to me we have what everybody has described as a real crunch coming up in the money markets. Whether PC sales will help I do not know, but I do not think anybody can say this would not help. So what is the harm in having it if it could possibly help the situation?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should support the position of the committee in the sale of the participation certificates. From listening to the discussion, I do not know that any time has been given to just what is involved here. I opposed initiation of this program, because what this is, in a nutshell, is the Government selling or committing its assets, notes owed to the Government, as security for the participation certificates. It amounts to mortgaging particular assets instead of borrowing money directly.

The PC's are nothing except I O U's backed up by notes which the Federal Government already owns.

I thought it unsound at the outset for our Government to start selling or committing its assets, which were not included in the determination of the amount of the public debt. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] said, we are now including such participation

certificates as a debt within the meaning of the public debt.

The House took action the other day, approving a motion or amendment I offered to hold all Government spending from appropriated funds back to 1967 spending, agency by agency and department by department. Exceptions were made as to trust funds, the Vietnam war, social security, veterans, medicare and other retirement and relief programs. Of course the REA, the CCC, TVA and a number of other organizations do not come within the term "appropriated funds." I appreciated the overwhelming support of the Members of the House. My amendment is estimated to cut the budget increases back by \$6 to \$8 billion—unfortunately in 2 days hearings in the Senate, the Director of Bureau of the Budget opposes our action, apparently so the executive department can decide what to hold back—and some of our colleagues on the other side seem to want the right to add items. As I told you then, we will be fortunate to continue to carry on as we did in 1967 for we have a war with wartime costs. Now as to the immediate issue. If we prohibit this sale of Government debentures for which our assets are collateral, whatever the technical facts may be, the public will take it that the deficiency between income and expenditures will be that much greater.

Believing it unwise at the outset to sell or commit our assets to pay operating costs, on a basis that would not list them as a part of the debt, I believe that we have gotten ourselves into a position now though we do count such certificates as a part of the debt, if we cut them out, because of public reaction we will increase the dangers of further inflationary pressures.

I hope that the other body—though I have my doubts—will go along with the action of this body in holding spending to the 1967 level, save the \$6 to \$8 billion in increases provided in the 1968 budget. If the Senate will only agree it will help much. However, if we strike out this item, we will have to borrow that much more money through regular channels, and in the public mind it will increase the spread between income and outgo, and further increase inflationary pressures, and demands for a tax increase.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the committee [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confused concerning what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said about it being inflationary not to do what is proposed at the present time with this costly participation certificate sales. It was my understanding this is just contrary to the facts of the situation.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said that if these additional participation certificates are issued it is going to cost approximately an additional unnecessary \$71 million. We know the period of maturity for these PC's will range from 2 to 20 years. Even if we strike a median on that, it appears that an additional financing charge of between \$700 and \$800 million will be added to the burdens of the Government of the



United States if this method of financing is adopted.

It seems to me that this would be demonstrably inflationary as well as wasteful, if the money can be procured in another and less expensive fashion—as it can by direct borrowing.

I believe it is our obligation here, representing the taxpayers, to insist that the Government not throw in its last chips as security for PC's, leaving little or nothing else to borrow on. We ought not to sanction this added waste. The motion to recommit should be supported.

I cannot agree with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] that a vote to limit the sale of participation certificates to the needs of the agency whose assets are being sold is a vote against funding for veterans and cities. This is not the case.

On the contrary, it is a vote to conserve those assets for the possible continued funding of the needs of veterans and cities for years to come. Those who urge the sale of these assets and use of the proceeds to finance the general operating costs of Government are in truth and reality the ones who are voting against veterans and cities.

Likewise, with all due respect to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], to suggest that in the long run the sale of these PC's has the prospect of stabilizing the money market is equally erroneous. There is no surer way to demoralize the money market in the long run than to permit Government refinancing at a subsidy level that is outright wasteful.

All are agreed that it costs more to issue PC's than to have Treasury borrowing. With long maturities and high interest payments there is nearly a billion dollars of unnecessary added cost to the American taxpayers in the present proposal which is supported by the administration in this body to make the present debt seem to be a little less than it actually is.

This is deception. It is fiscally irresponsible. In the long run it will cost every man, woman, and child in this country added taxes for playing politics with the Treasury.

I refuse to be a party to this and I hope other Members on the other side of the aisle will do the same. I could not support this practice were a Republican administration in office. We should not be paying such a premium for this type of financing. Hundreds of millions of wasted dollars are involved and the people should know this. Why take the most expensive way when we do not have to? We face a fiscal crisis.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Sales Participation Act when it was before this House some time ago, and I support the effort here today, in this conference report, to authorize the marketing of sales participation certificates to the extent of \$3,235,000,000 for two agencies, the Veterans' Administration and HUD.

At the time we considered initially the

sales participation legislation argument was made that it would be all right to dispose of these capital assets under certain circumstances. It was said it would be all right if we included whatever assets we did dispose of by borrowing or by sales under the limitations of the national debt. This we have since that time done.

The argument seems to be today, to me, that no one is arguing we should not dispose of at least some of these capital assets. The argument simply seems to be how many of these assets are we going to authorize the disposal of? The budget recommended up to \$5 billion.

So the question to me, quite simply, is one of how much since we all agree that we should utilize this method under these conditions of tight money, where inflation is running rampant, to help finance the Federal Government. The money market is in real trouble. Chaos and uncertainty prevail.

If we are all agreed that some certificates should be marketed, it should not be too difficult, it seems to me, to agree to go ahead and authorize sales well under the budget request of \$5 billion, to the extent of \$3,235 million. Some say that this is a bookkeeping gimmick to make the deficit appear less. I do not know whether it is a gimmick or not, but if it is, it still seems to me the most simple way under existing circumstances of lessening the impact of inflation by making more money available to the Federal Government to help finance what is already a too large deficit and has been for too long. The impact of additional direct Treasury borrowing upon the already short supply of money simply seems to me to dictate that we should go ahead and utilize these capital assets to lessen the impact of inflation on the economy. In fact we have no choice, grasping straws as we are to avert economic disaster. It might well be the most economical way.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let us get one thing clear. The actual deficit is not going to be changed one penny by whether we authorize participation certificate sales or not. It may change the bookkeeping, but it will not change the deficit picture one iota. The President's Commission on the Budget concept recently came out and said that it should not be used as a device to make expenditures look different than they otherwise are. What will you be doing if you adopt this conference report? You will be authorizing the Government to go out into the money market, in a tight market, with the most expensive type of borrowing participation certificates command the highest interest rate of any kind of Government borrowing. How silly can we be? We are worried about high interest. The way to prevent it is to borrow at the cheapest rate of interest possible—not at the highest rate possible. We are worried about the cost of carrying the national debt. Author-

izing the sale of participation certificates only increases that cost. That is the issue here.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Surely I yield. The gentleman yielded me my time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman made a good argument for the participation certificate sales during the previous administration. I commend him for his position then.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, I did not, because in fact we had no legislation on it in those days. It was done in a limited area and a small amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

In fact, if you want to look at the facts, we had sales of about \$1 billion over a period of some 10 years prior to 1965. And now \$11 billion of these participation certificates have either been sold or are contemplated to be sold in the next year. The point I want to make is that the Secretary of the Treasury in appearances before the Committee on Ways and Means a couple of months ago admitted that the sale of participation certificates as a means of financing the deficit would not have any effect as far as lessening the pressures of inflation are concerned and would not have any effect on lessening the credit crunch.

The real issue before us is whether we are going to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow \$2 billion in the most expensive way possible. There is no question that it will cost us more to borrow through participation certificates than would be the case if we borrowed in the usual manner.

The motion to recommit should be supported. The authority to borrow \$2 billion by the sale of participation certificates should be eliminated.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there are at least three ways to improve the budget situation—and everybody, of course, wants to improve our budget situation. One way is to cut appropriations. We have done that in this bill to the tune of more than three quarters of a billion dollars. Second, we can authorize the sale of participation certificates. Third, we can have a tax adjustment and plug the tax loopholes. The Committee on Ways and Means has not acted in the latter area. At the present time we are considering the matter of participation certificates. We believe the Secretary of the Treasury should be allowed to sell these participation certificates in the next year. We have \$33 billion worth of frozen assets that should we put to work in the public interest.

This is a sound concept—a concept proven by practice.

This is another way to improve the

budgetary situation and this is the way to move important programs forward.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members of the House would vote down the motion to recommit and allow the full budget level of participation sales to be approved.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 9960, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

Most specifically, I rise in opposition to the adoption of amendment No. 48, which deletes the proposal to appropriate \$1,000,000 for native housing in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very disappointed to see members of the conference committee from the other body unanimously recede from their position of demanding the inclusion of funds for Alaska native housing; and I was equally disappointed to find that not one member of the conference committee on either side of the aisle, in either the House or the other body, reported disagreement with the action of a majority of the committee to delete this small appropriation for Alaskan natives.

The \$1,000,000 was originally removed from the House version of the bill, allegedly because at that time no plans and specifications had been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. The plans and specifications were subsequently completed and forwarded to Washington, and were placed before the other body when the bill was being considered. Members of the conference committee were furnished with the plans and specifications and supporting data, thus fully meeting the objections which were stated in the House committee report. Thereafter, I contacted each of the conference committee members pointing out the extreme importance of this small appropriation to the impoverished Alaskan natives.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have failed to convey how desperately this assistance is needed for the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. These rugged Americans have mastered one of the most inhospitable areas on earth—the frozen tundra, the arctic coastline, the harsh and unforgiving winter isolation in the desolate and sparsely populated interior regions of Alaska, and the unpredictable and harsh Arctic and Bering Sea winter icepacks. Some of the Alaska natives live in urban areas, and some in the milder but still very difficult areas of central, southeastern, and southwestern Alaska. But, many of these Alaskan natives have endured in a land where life is not retained without considerable personal effort. Most of the homes of the natives are dilapidated

and beyond any hope of meaningful repair. Most of these units are characterized by inadequate original construction, and are frequently built from such materials as packing crates, cardboard, driftwood, crude lumber, and tarpaper. Their homes are small and inadequate by any other standard, usually with a single heat source—an oil stove—are poorly ventilated, and frequently have no insulation. Anywhere else in America, these homes would be considered completely unfit for human habitation, and yet these wonderful people must somehow survive in harsh arctic and subarctic climates where temperatures drop below -50° Fahrenheit.

I know that I am called upon from time to time to ask for special consideration for the natives from Alaska. Although I am compelled to do so, I do it gladly because the situation is entirely unique under the American flag. By comparison with the appalling poverty in many of the native communities of Alaska, the worse pockets of poverty in the remotest areas of Appalachia seem to be areas of wealth and affluence. This is not a humorous comparison, but quite a sad commentary. As a matter of national policy, the United States is committed to helping disadvantaged people around the globe find a path toward economic self-sufficiency and personal dignity.

Some of the Alaskan natives have successfully made a transition from the old culture to the new. Most have not, despite tens of millions of dollars spent annually by the Federal and State Governments in their behalf. Many live in conditions that surpass the worse urban slums to be found anywhere in the United States—perhaps anywhere except the deepest recesses of Africa, where frigid temperatures are not a factor for survival.

These people, the Alaskan natives, represent about one-fourth of Alaska's civilian population. As such, they can be either a tremendous economic burden or a great reservoir of opportunity. Their future is perhaps the most critical problem the State of Alaska faces today.

While 25 percent of the civilian population of Alaska is native, unemployment is appallingly high, probably averaging 60 percent unemployment across the length and breadth of Alaska. Jobs are simply scarce in the villages, other than subsistence hunting, fishing, and other related activities. In some Alaskan villages, the only person regularly employed is the janitor in the school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

If the Alaskan native were lazy, lacking in personal resources, he could not have survived for long. He is a strong, gentle, able individual; but today he is caught between two worlds—and if his life is appalling and embarrassing to the nonnative observer, it can only be more shamefully degrading to him and the other individuals involved.

Mr. Speaker, I can follow no other course than to solemnly urge that the conference report be recommitted to the conference committee. While the motion to recommit will contain no specific instructions to report H.R. 9960 back to the House with a provision appropriat-

ing the \$1,000,000 for Alaska native housing, I do nevertheless solemnly urge you to vote overwhelmingly for recommitment, and then importune each and every member of the conference committee to courageously reconsider this matter and include the Alaska native housing appropriation so desperately needed.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit and I am casting my vote today in favor of authorizing the full amount of participation certificate sales provided for under the conference report on H.R. 9960. I feel the time has come to put an end to attempts to make this tried and tested form of Government financing into a political football. Time and time again our Republican colleagues have unsuccessfully challenged this sensible way of selling Government assets, and again today they are doing the same thing in nothing less than a political attempt to embarrass the President in this difficult time in our country's fiscal affairs.

We certainly have enough real issues and problems before us so that we do not have to resurrect an imaginary issue involving the sales of participation certificates. The Congress in 1966 saw fit to approve the participation sales program, and now, in keeping with this decision, we should grant authority for it to continue smoothly ahead as programmed.

I want to make it clear at the outset of my remarks that there is no real link between participation sales and spending. Participation certificates are merely a financing technique. They are clearly not a supplemental source of funds or a means of avoiding congressional control over Federal spending.

The participation sales program over the years has become a tested and successful method of disposing of "pooled" Government assets of various Government agencies. The program has the support of financial experts in and out of Government and of such organizations as the American Bankers Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans groups.

It is incongruous to me that our Republican colleagues should attack this program. By a similar pooling of Government assets, the Eisenhower administration had sales totaling about \$1.5 billion. President Eisenhower said in his budget message of 1955:

Private capital will be gradually substituted for the Government investment until Government funds are fully repaid and private owners take over responsibility for the program.

Mr. Speaker, these comments are the basis of the participation program under the Johnson administration. This program, as in the Eisenhower administration, is sound and sensible.

First, it permits a partnership between public and private initiative by permitting the flow of private credit into Federal programs.

Second, by facilitating this flow of credit, a more effective bridge between Federal loan programs and the vast capital resources of the private market is established, allowing for maximum advantage of the flexibility, ingenuity and efficiency of these markets.



And lastly, the program is a means of bringing greater coordination to the asset sales program in a far more orderly, efficient and cheaper way than by the disorganized, competitive efforts in the past of individual Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the harsh, unfair, and unworthy political attacks that have been made against this participation program today, and I have cast my vote accordingly.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Eisenhower administration I was fortunate enough to obtain from

the administration agreement on a 12-year program for the regeneration for our hospital and medical system operated by the Veterans' Administration. As originally conceived, we planned to appropriate \$75 million each year for this project. In many instances this has been achieved and generally speaking we are just about on schedule or just a little bit behind.

In fiscal year 1964 the appropriation was \$76 million; in 1965 it was \$98 million; in 1966 it was \$90 million and in 1967 it was \$52 million. The Department of Medicine and Surgery for fiscal year 1968 requested \$126 million. This was reduced by review in the Comptroller's Office of the Veterans' Administration to \$106 million. The Bureau of the Budget chopped this in half and set the figure at \$52 million, and this is the exact

amount which the House voted on the 17th and the Senate committee concurred in this amendment, but added \$600,000 for modernization and expansion of the Veterans' Administration hospital at White River Junction. The conference agreement which I am supporting here today provides for \$52,600,000 but deletes any provision earmarking \$600,000 for a specific project. I cite this history to give the background for this long-term program which the Congress has always supported and also to emphasize the point that the appropriation we are hopefully voting today has already been cut in half from the need originally estimated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Specifically this \$52 million appropriation would provide for the following projects:

#### CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

Item	Total cost	Amount requested	Item	Total cost	Amount requested
Replacement and relocation hospitals:			Research:		
Chicago, Ill. (760 beds), funds to complete.....	\$24,565,000	\$2,672,000	Denver, Colo. (10,000 net sq. ft. addition), design funds.....	\$702,000	\$107,000
San Diego, Calif. (1,040 beds), construction funds.....	30,000,000	29,000,000	Madison, Wis. (16,000 net sq. ft. addition), funds to complete.....	1,014,000	465,000
Seattle, Wash. (bed expansion), design funds.....	24,667,000	1,000,000	Oklahoma City, Okla. (15,082 net sq. ft. addition), funds to complete.....	1,525,000	380,000
Tampa, Fla. (720 beds), funds to complete.....	18,762,000	1,295,000	Minneapolis, Minn. (animal research facility), design funds.....	233,000	25,000
Total replacement and relocation hospitals.....		33,967,000	Palo Alto, Calif. (10,000 net sq. ft. addition).....	775,000	775,000
Other hospital improvements:			Pittsburgh, Pa. (8,000 net sq. ft. addition), design funds.....	620,000	73,000
Chillicothe, Ohio (modernize boiler plant), construction funds.....	1,341,000	1,221,000	Washington, D.C. (20,000 net sq. ft. addition), construction funds.....	1,407,000	1,305,000
Columbia, S.C., cardiopulmonary clinic.....	196,000	196,000	Total research.....		3,130,000
Los Angeles, Calif., smoke barriers and standpipes.....	109,000	109,000	General administration.....		1,977,000
Mountain Home, Tenn. (boiler plant), design funds.....	1,300,000	100,000	Total request, 1968.....		52,000,000
West Haven, Conn. (exterior brick repairs), construction funds.....	2,381,000	2,281,000			
West Haven, Conn., outpatient clinic consolidation.....	208,000	208,000			
West Haven, Conn., fire sprinklers.....	188,000	188,000			
Intensive care units at selected hospitals.....	6,825,000	6,825,000			
Miscellaneous projects, \$25,000 to \$100,000.....	1,298,000	1,298,000			
Administrator's discretionary fund.....	500,000	500,000			
Total other improvements.....		12,926,000			

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recall to Members of Congress the fact that last year the President signed into law the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act providing benefits for veterans who served on or after January 1955, including those now on duty in Vietnam. The bill was patterned after the Korean GI bill of rights and passed both Houses by unanimous vote. Recently we have liberalized this provision again by unanimous vote, and this new law is designated Public Law 90-77. Readjustment benefits are provided for in this appropriation in the amount of \$427,200,000, and thousands of veterans who are taking training are those who have only recently returned from service in Vietnam. The most recent public law which I have made reference to will produce 110,000 compensation and pension adjudication cases attributable to the Vietnam group, 82,000 applications for education and training and a little over 30,000 housing and loan applications.

These are commitments which we have made and we must now pay for them. It is one of the rising costs of war, and I know that all Members of this House want to meet their responsibilities in this field. I cite these facts and give this history because I think it is pertinent for us at this time to keep this in mind when we are considering the 1968 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, which

has been passed by the House totaling approximately \$6,650,000,000.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the participation sales program at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and then I shall yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations such time as may remain and then move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, by a margin of only a very few votes the House in May 1966 passed the Participation Sales Act. Many of us at that time opposed this measure as a budget gimmick and warned that sale of these participations at an interest cost of about one-half of 1 percent over Treasury financing would exert upward pressure on the money market causing diversion of badly needed funds from the home mortgage market. Events proved us to be correct even to the point

that the Treasury itself for a period of months banned the sale of participations.

We are again in a period of tight money with long-term governments and municipal bonds lower in price than even the low points reached in the monetary stringency last fall. For instance, long-term Treasury 4 1/4s of 1987-92 are about three points lower in price than they were at the worst period last year.

The conference report proposes that this appropriation bill restore \$2.35 billion of participation sales authority for the current year which was knocked out by the House in passing this appropriation bill. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disorganized state of long-term Government and municipal market it is perfectly obvious that if an attempt was made to sell long-term participations in this market that it would completely and disastrously disrupt the long-term bond market. If the administration would attempt to sell \$2.3 billion of participations in the short-term market there is no question but that this would force up short-term interest rates to the point where Government agency securities again would be sold at prices to yield over 6 percent. The result would be that high yielding participation certificates would again draw funds from the savings institutions which provide home mortgage credit. The home mortgage market which has been enjoying a splen-

did recovery would be thrown into a tail-spin just as it was last fall. If we want to provoke a new crisis in the home mortgage market, granting this participation sales authority as provided in this conference report, would be a sure way of creating that result.

The President's Commission on the Budget has included in its report a recommendation that participation sales be treated the same as Treasury obligations in the budget. If that recommendation is carried out, stripping participation sales of budget gimmickery there will be no incentive for using the participation sales device. It is pure misleading budget gimmickery costing the taxpayers at least one-half of 1 percent more interest than would otherwise have to be paid by the Government to finance through conventional Treasury borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, pending the time when the Congress ends the mockery of participation sales financing we should move on the problem as it comes before us. Specifically, this conference report should be rejected or recommitted with instructions to delete this \$2.3 billion of participation sales authority.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the balance of the time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to take 15 minutes, but to take only a moment.

This question has been thoroughly discussed; it has been reviewed and sifted. I think that most of the Members have made up their minds as to their position upon it.

Principally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the primary point of interest here, and undertake to make it very specific. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] have already undertaken to make clear the fact that we have pending before us the conference report on this legislation.

The rent supplement matter and the model cities matter will come up separately; they are not involved in any way in the conference report.

We are voting now, and separately, upon the conference report.

The largest amounts in the conference report, of course, are those for the Veterans' Administration. I would hope that we would bear that in mind.

It is my opinion that it would be most unfortunate, in principle, for us to recommit the conference report at this stage, when we have worked for months and months in an effort to try to reach agreement and bring these matters to a final resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that within a bill which carries appropriations of more than \$10 billion, one cannot hope to obtain complete agreement, one cannot have everyone in the House fully agree.

There are some items about which there is considerable disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to participation sales certificates there was some complaint to the effect that they were

not being counted within the budget ceiling. That point, however, does not remedy the fiscal situation. Where we are confronted with a possible budget deficit of nearly \$30 billion, in essence, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has pointed out, I can see nothing wrong with selling some of these assets with which to finance governmental programs. We are doing it with our eyes open. No one is trying to deceive anyone and no one can tell what the situation may be which will confront us within the next few months.

We are threatened with a deficit of perhaps as much as \$29 billion, and if this motion to recommit is adopted and should become the law, it will contribute over \$2 billion toward the final deficit figure.

So I see no reason why we should worsen the fiscal picture at this stage. I see no reason why we should deny the executive branch the opportunity for some flexibility. While it may cost some more in the next few months—it may or it may not—in the long run it has the prospect of helping to stabilize the money market and bringing about more orderly management of our current fiscal problems.

I believe the Members have made up their minds on the issue before us and I believe the majority will vote "no" on the motion to recommit. Mr. Speaker, I join the subcommittee and I join the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and others in urging that this conference report not be recommitted; that the conference report be approved; and then that we proceed to the more controversial matters in the separate motions involving rent supplements and model cities.

I would hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] would move the previous question at this point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that the Senate has receded or reduced items on 49 of the 77 items in the conference report, and the House conferees have sustained more than 75 percent of dollar differences between the two bodies on the items in conference. The savings below the Senate-passed bill are almost half a billion dollars. This is based on the motions we will make in the House today after the conference report is adopted. Furthermore, we will have an opportunity to vote separately on appropriations for the rent supplements and model cities programs. If the House adopts the conference report and chooses to sustain its previous position on the items in disagreement, we will have prevailed on more than 90 percent of the total dollars in conference.

In my judgment we have brought the Members a good conference report, and I believe it should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report, and I urge that the Members vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JONAS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONAS moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9960 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 43, 44, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 208, answered "present" 5, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—184

Abernethy	Dole	McDade
Adair	Duncan	McDonald,
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Mich.
Andrews,	Edwards, Ala.	McEwen
N. Dak.	Erlenborn	MacGregor
Arends	Esch	Mailliard
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Martin
Ayres	Findley	Mathias, Calif.
Baring	Fino	May
Battin	Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	Meskill
Betts	Fulton, Pa.	Michel
Blester	Gardner	Miller, Ohio
Blackburn	Gathings	Minshall
Bolton	Goodell	Mize
Bow	Goodling	Moore
Bray	Gross	Morse, Mass.
Brock	Grover	Morton
Brotzman	Gubser	Mosher
Brown, Mich.	Gude	Myers
Brown, Ohio	Gurney	Nelsen
Broyhill, N.C.	Haley	Ottinger
Broyhill, Va.	Hall	Passman
Buchanan	Halleck	Pelly
Burke, Fla.	Halpern	Pettis
Burton, Utah	Hammer-	Pike
Bush	schmidt	Pirnie
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Poff
Cahill	Harrison	Pollock
Carter	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Cederberg	Harvey	Quie
Chamberlain	Heckler, Mass.	Quillen
Clancy	Horton	Rallsback
Clausen,	Hosmer	Reid, Ill.
Don H.	Hunt	Reifel
Clawson, Del.	Hutchinson	Reinecke
Cleveland	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Collier	Jonas	Riegle
Colmer	Keith	Robison
Conable	King, N.Y.	Roth
Corbett	Kupferman	Roudebush
Cowger	Kuykendall	Rumsfeld
Cramer	Laird	Ruppe
Cunningham	Langen	Ryan
Curtis	Latta	Sandman
Davis, Wis.	Lennon	Satterfield
Dellenback	Lipcomb	Saylor
Denney	Lloyd	Schadeberg
Derwinski	Lukens	Scherle
Devine	McClory	Schneebell
Dickinson	McClure	Schweiker



Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Shriver  
Skubitz  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Okla.  
Snyder  
Springer  
Stafford  
Stanton  
Steiger, Ariz.

Steiger, Wis.  
Taft  
Talcott  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Vander Jagt  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Watson  
Whalen  
Whalley

Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams, Pa.  
Wilson, Bob  
Winn  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Zion  
Zwach

## NAYS—208

Abbitt  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Annunzio  
Ashmore  
Barrett  
Bennett  
Bevill  
Bingham  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Boland  
Bolling  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brinkley  
Brooks  
Burke, Mass.  
Burlison  
Burton, Calif.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cabell  
Carey  
Casey  
Clark  
Cohelan  
Conyers  
Culver  
Daddario  
Daniels  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dent  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Dow  
Dowdy  
Downing  
Dulski  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Ellberg  
Evans, Colo.  
Everett  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fasell  
Feighan  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flynt  
Foley  
Ford  
William D.  
Fountain  
Fraser  
Friedel  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis

Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Gonzalez  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffiths  
Hagan  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hardy  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hicks  
Hollifield  
Holland  
Howard  
Hull  
Hungate  
Ichord  
Irwin  
Jacobs  
Jarman  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.  
Karsten  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kee  
Kelly  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Kornegay  
Kyros  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Long, Md.  
McCarthy  
McFall  
McMillan  
Madden  
Mahon  
Marsh  
Matsunaga  
Meeds  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris, N. Mex.  
Moss  
Multer

Murphy, Ill.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nichols  
Nix  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
Olsen  
O'Neal, Ga.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Patman  
Patten  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pickle  
Pool  
Price, Ill.  
Pryor  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Randall  
Rees  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
St Germain  
Scheuer  
Shipley  
Sikes  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Sullivan  
Taylor  
Teague, Tex.  
Tenzer  
Tiernan  
Tuck  
Tunney  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Waldie  
Walker  
Watts  
White  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wolf  
Wright  
Young  
Zablocki

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Bates  
Berry

Conte  
O'Konski

Yates

## NOT VOTING—35

Ashley  
Aspinall  
Bell  
Boggs  
Broomfield  
Brown, Calif.  
Button  
Celler  
Corman  
Diggs  
Gettys  
Hébert  
Herlong

Jones, Mo.  
Kleppe  
Kyl  
Long, La.  
McCulloch  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Mathias, Md.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Philbin  
Poage  
Rarick  
Reid, N.Y.

Resnick  
Roybal  
St. Onge  
Smith, N.Y.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Udall  
Utt  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Wilson  
Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Boggs against.  
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Philbin against.  
Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Poage against.  
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. St. Onge against.  
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Aspinall against.  
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Kleppe for, with Mr. Gettys against.  
Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.  
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Celler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.  
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Button.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Rarick.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Udall.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ST. ONGE]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 17, insert:

"PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION

## "SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the President's Commission on Postal Organization, established by Executive Order 11341 of April 8, 1967, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and including reimbursement to the Post Office Department for funds ad-

vanced to the Commission from the appropriation for 'Administration and regional operation,' \$1,500,000, to be available from August 1, 1967, and to remain available until June 30, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the several amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 12, line 3, insert:

"Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration), Hammond, Indiana, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$265,000;".

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 12, line 8, insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$1,177,000;".

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 12, line 22, insert:

"Federal office buildings, Goldsboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$205,000;".

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 12, line 24, insert:

"Post office, courthouse and Federal office building, Raleigh, North Carolina in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$1,693,000;".

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 13, line 1, insert:

"Post office and courthouse, Wilkesboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$234,000;".

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 13, line 3, insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Fargo, North Dakota, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$437,000;".

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 13, line 10, insert:

"Federal office building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$735,000;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 58 and Senate amendment No. 59 be considered en bloc, since they relate to the same item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report

the Senate amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: On page 36, line 23, strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000".

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 37, line 2, strike out "\$237,000,000" and insert "\$537,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58 and 59.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GIAIMO

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GIAIMO moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 58 and 59 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, these two amendments numbered 58 and 59 relate to the model cities program including the amount for urban renewal projects in model cities areas. These amendments do not relate to the rent supplement program. That will be considered later.

This has to do with the model cities program which the House previously adopted and which the Congress has favored.

The item of \$12,000,000 for planning is not in conference. The House and Senate have agreed on the full amount of \$12,000,000 for planning for the model cities program. The House recommended a modest beginning of \$150,000,000 for the model cities program. The Senate insists on \$400,000,000 which is the budgeted amount, the full amount, for the model cities program.

The other item relates to urban renewal projects in model cities. The House has approved \$75 million for this phase of the model cities program. This will enable urban renewal in model cities to get started on a modest basis. The Senate recommended \$125 million for the first-year funding for this purpose. Over all, by way of totals, the House is recommending \$237 million for planning, for model cities grants, and for urban renewal. The Senate is recommending \$537 million. So there is in disagreement \$300 million.

My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] wants to yield to the position of the Senate for the full amount. Feeling that we should support the position of the House and the Appropriations Committee, I thought the matter should be brought back for a separate vote. My motion is that the House insist upon its position.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I support the position of the gentleman from Tennessee and op-

pose the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut. The preferential motion would accept the Senate figures. We think they are too high. The only way to avoid doing so on this item is to vote down the preferential motion, and then the vote will come on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate. This matter will then go back to conference where we will have another opportunity to have a meeting of the minds and to compromise these differences.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I should like to say that if you vote down the preferential motion, we will have an opportunity to go back to conference and work out the matter on model cities. We hope we can reach an agreement.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. There is another reason I support the position of the gentleman from Tennessee. We are now in the second quarter of the new fiscal year. This House by a substantial vote agreed with the Appropriations Committee back in the spring. There is more reason to agree with us now than there was then, because half a year has already elapsed and the Department has not moved one iota from the position it was in a year ago today. It has had \$11 million of planning money available for nearly 12 months—and it has not disbursed one dime of it. It has not selected one city.

The testimony before the House committee was that it will require from 6 months to a year for the cities to get their plans in once they get their planning money.

I therefore submit that the department will not use more than the House figures for construction money even if we should grant it. In view of the budgetary situation I certainly concur in the view of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House should not abruptly accept the Senate figures but should send us back to where another effort will be made to reconcile the differences.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House adopt the Senate figures on this item because of the fact that this is the model cities program about which we have heard so much. In effect, what we would do would be to adopt the \$400 million instead of the \$150 million for supplemental grants, and \$125 million instead of the \$75 million for urban renewal, which is tied to the model cities program. It is most important, in my opinion, that we give extremely serious consideration to this bill and to this amendment, because in my opinion and in the opinion of many of us, this is the most important aspect of our poverty program.

We have heard much discussion about the poverty program. I have been one of those who in many instances has criticized the poverty program. It is no secret

that attempts will undoubtedly be made, strong attempts, to cut certain parts of the poverty program in the very near future. But if there is one program that deserves our merit and consideration, if there is one program which will really try to do a good job, it is the model cities program.

We have to get it off the ground and get it moving, and get it moving quickly. I want to stress that we are not talking about expenditures of moneys. We are talking about obligational authority and appropriations. Very little of this money is going to be spent in the immediate future, but what it is going to do is to allow HUD and the cities of this Nation to begin their planning, to begin real planning looking toward the day when the cities will qualify with HUD, and when they will be able to get the funds to initiate these all-embracing, comprehensive model city programs.

It would be shortsighted to cut this program at this present day. This is not the kind of program that we can put over until next year, and it is not a good argument to say that quite a few months in the fiscal year have passed and that HUD will not be able to expend all the moneys this year.

Again, I repeat, we are not talking about expenditures of money. We are talking about enabling HUD to plan and to make its long-range plans with the cities, so HUD can get started.

There is a long leadtime in all these programs involving cities, certainly in any urban renewal program, so we have to take account of the fact that there has to be good planning, long leadtime, so we can have some results in the near future. Again, it does not mean the money is going to be expended immediately. I cannot help repeating that.

It is going to enable HUD and the cities to study it comprehensively, to begin their planning, to get those plans in to HUD and get this very important program moving.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman speaks of long leadtime planning requiring this sum of hundreds of millions of dollars, does he mean this money is needed so that contracts or obligational authority may be permitted or entered into?

Mr. GIAIMO. Exactly.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That unless this money is appropriated there can be no contracts, no authority to enter into any obligation insofar as model cities are concerned and planning is something separate and apart. The only way we can avoid holding up this program for years is to enable contracts to be entered into within a reasonable time and, without this, the contracts may have to be held up for several years?

Mr. GIAIMO. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I trust the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be voted up. He is asking



this House to recede and concur with the Senate amendment on the model cities program. That provides for \$537 million, of which \$125 million is for urban renewal in model cities areas and \$400 million is for supplementary grants in the model cities programs.

The \$537 million recommended by the Senate is \$125 million less than that which was asked for by the Bureau of the Budget. This item, Mr. Speaker, was considered by this House on May 17 of this year. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee brought his bill to the floor at that time, and since that time there have been very considerable changes and incidents which have occurred all over this Nation. There has been some different kind of thinking on the part of, I believe, everyone as to how best to meet the terrible and complex problems that are perplexing the cities of this Nation. This program is addressed not only to the great and large cities, but also to some of the smaller cities in this Nation.

This whole program is addressed to solving the problems that our larger and smaller cities have been experiencing in the past couple of years.

Incidentally, this is not a partisan matter. Many Members on the other side voted favorably on the model cities program. A great number of Governors throughout this Nation have expressed their concern and feeling on this program. They favor it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings developed by the Senate there were a number of Governors who expressed their concern over the failure on the part of the Congress to fully fund the model cities program, to fully fund it as budgeted by the Department. That expression was offered to the Senate by the Governors of Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, this clearly shows it is not a partisan matter. It transcends all political considerations. The question here is whether or not Congress is willing to do what it has to do if we are to meet the severe problems and the heavy burdens that the core cities are staggering under.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a telegram which I believe is important. It was sent to the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices. It reads:

Conference committee failure to agree on full funding for model cities and rent supplements portends further disaster for urban areas. Our August emergency convocation urged that "Congress must move without delay on urban programs. The country can wait no longer for measures that have too long been denied the people of the cities and the Nation as a whole". We ask your support of the Senate position on these measures.

Mr. Speaker, this telegram was signed by Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time-Life, Inc., and A. Philip Randolph, the head of the Sleeping Car Porters of the United States, both of

whom are cochairmen of the Urban Coalition in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the proposal of the gentleman from Connecticut attempts to do. It asks the House to stand by the position of the Senate, to put in this item to increase the amount from the House figure of \$237 million to \$537 million, a \$300 million increase.

I hope the House will vote for the proposed increase.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I support full funding of the model cities program.

I want to speak briefly on a subject of serious consequence for the cities of our country—the pending appropriations for the model cities program. I was deeply disturbed last May when the House voted to cut the President's request of \$400 million for the model cities program to an inadequate \$150 million, and the grants for urban renewal projects in model neighborhoods from \$250 million to \$75 million. I cannot believe that the majority of this House fully recognized either the seriousness of the problems this program will attack or the sizable impact this program can have on the lives of the people in these problem-ridden slum areas.

In plain talk, our cities need these funds and our people need these funds. Given model cities they can begin rebuilding our cities in earnest. Without them we are all back where we started from—in the festering breeding grounds of riots and violence.

A brief analysis of the 193 applications for model cities funds shows that the program is accurately aimed at the truly hard-core slum areas that Congress intended the program to attack when we authorized it last year. Applications came from large and small cities and counties throughout the country, including my own city of Philadelphia, and gave a rather frightening picture of the problems slum neighborhoods face.

Problems of blight and deterioration are not restricted to our large cities, or to one section of the country. Of the 193 applications 75 came from cities of under 50,000 and six cities with less than 5,000 people want a model cities program. Applications came from 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Over 7 million people live in the deteriorated neighborhoods selected for upgrading by these cities. Three out of every 10 families have incomes of less than \$3,000 annually. This is roughly twice the proportion of low-income families living in all urban areas at the time of the last census. Unemployment among people living in these neighborhoods is 2½ times the rate for the entire civilian labor force. Almost one-third of the houses in these areas are substandard, triple the rate for all urban areas. Education, basic in these people's battle for a better life is sadly lacking—3 out of every 10 adults have not had as much as 8 years of schooling. These are conditions which no reasonable or com-

passionate person can ignore. These are conditions which have transformed quiet desperation into open violence.

The model cities program offers us an entirely new approach to doing something about the poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, and unemployment in these neighborhoods. By mounting a concentrated attack on all of the problems, model cities will enable cities to make the most effective and efficient use of urban programs which Congress has already put on the books and funded. What makes model cities unique is that it will give cities the chance to tie together all of the Federal programs and end the piecemeal, fragmented approach that has too long frustrated city administrators and obstructed progress in our cities. At the same time it will require the locality to coordinate all its efforts, both public and private, to make the best use of Federal aids.

The impact the model cities program will have on the grave problems I have outlined is far more than the funds authorized. Because this program builds on the effective use of existing programs and the coordinated input of State, city, and private resources, the funds will have a striking multiplier effect. Every dollar we vote now for supplemental or operating funds will generate \$10 from local public funds, private sources, and other Federal funds.

Therefore, we are talking about \$4 billion or more worth of help for our hard-pressed cities. I cannot believe that any Member can cast a vote for anything less in the face of the needs of our urban citizens. We must seize this opportunity to improve the lives of slum residents and to upgrade whole blighted areas of our cities. The price of doing it is cheap. The cost of not doing it can be hazardous. Let us vote the whole appropriation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will recede from its earlier action and accept the full appropriation, as approved by the Senate and recommended by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, for the model cities program contained in this Independent Offices Appropriations Act conference report now before us.

Over the past few months, our appropriation action on this particular subject has taken on increasingly vast significance to the unity of this country and our people and it further represents the measure of our response toward curing a disease that is threatening the very foundations of our society.

Whatever varying reflections we may have upon and about the tragic violence and destruction that has recently been occurring in so many cities throughout the country, I think it is universally and unmistakably clear that the underlying causes of such tragedy ought to be and must be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The vehicle through which this correction can be most surely and effectively carried out is the appropriation containing adequate aid to the cities of this country that is included in the Senate version of this conference report.

Very truly if such an appropriation is

permitted to stand reduced to the point of practical obliteration or elimination of urban programs, most of our cities will be left without any hope of help in a vital task that is obviously beyond their individual capacities.

May I further say that such action might well become one of the greatest imprudences of modern history since it would undoubtedly generate new and higher despair and frustration among great numbers of our people throughout this Nation.

Let me please remind you that when this Congress passed the original model cities bill, it was making practically an inherently binding promise not just to a comparatively few and restrictively selected cities that might come to be afflicted with riots and property destruction, but to all those numerous cities qualified for assistance on the basic grounds of low-income population, adequate housing shortages, and associated standards.

At the present time, hundreds of such cities all over the country have invested much time and overtime of community officials and expert volunteers, together with community money, to apply for this assistance, and this includes my own home city of Worcester, Mass., which has a nationally recognized reputation for community cooperation, dedication, and efficiency and accomplishment in planning, projection, and fulfillment of development programs. If this House is now to refuse adequate appropriations and funding for the fundamentally qualified city applicants for this particular Federal help, it will be tantamount to a contradiction and betrayal of the words and promises that were enacted into law less than a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again exhort my colleagues here to approve the Senate adopted model cities appropriation to permit my community—and all other qualified communities—to participate in this demonstration cities program that is so wisely designed to grant all of our citizens, of whatever race or color or circumstance, the opportunity to rightfully share in our national heritage and to enable this country to truly fulfill its destiny of leadership in a world at peace.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when this issue was before the House earlier this year I supported the funding of the model or demonstration cities program at the \$237 million level which was adopted by the House. I still support the program and believe it holds great potential for elimination of many of our urban ills. The program is tailored along the lines of the block-grant approach and with this I also concur. However, I cannot support the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut to recede and accept the Senate version of the funding of this program, which more than doubles the amount provided by the House. I will continue to support the amount the House initially voted for the funding of this program and would support a reasonable increase in such funding. I am certain that defeat of this motion will permit the conferees to arrive at an appropriate level of funding which recognizes both the need for, and value of,

the program and our present budgetary problems.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Giaimo motion that the House recede to the Senate figure of \$537 million for the model cities program. This would have provided \$300 million more than the House figure of \$237 million for this important and urgently needed program for our cities. I deeply regret the Giaimo motion was defeated.

I also supported the Yates motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide \$40 million for the rent supplement program. It is unfortunate the House had provided no funds for this program, and it is even more unfortunate the Yates motion to correct this error was defeated. I have been a strong supporter of both the model cities program and the rent supplement program and naturally I am distressed over action taken in the House today.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in considering this conference report pertaining to the appropriation on independent offices, Housing and Urban Development, I do hope that the Members will support the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman GIAIMO, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

The other body has provided for a reasonable sum of \$537 million to support the installation of the model cities program. This reduction which the minority party and some Members on the Democratic side are supporting, will reduce the model cities initial appropriation from \$537 to \$237 million.

If this reduction of \$300 million is adopted by the House, the model cities program will be greatly handicapped and the organization and progress of a program which will eventually aid many urban families throughout the United States, will be impeded.

It is good economy for Members to vote for sufficient money to establish programs to indirectly aid millions of needy families in the urban areas throughout our Nation. The expenditures made in this program will pay off over a period of years and bring millions of dollars worth of taxes into the local, State, and Federal treasuries from families who are now on relief or do not have sufficient income to pay taxes unless jobs and employment are offered to some of our more unfortunate urban citizens and thus help them provide for themselves.

It has been announced in the papers only yesterday that our population has reached 200 million. In 1915 the population of our Nation was but 100 million. In 50 years' time our population has increased 100 million. It is estimated that the next 20 years will bring about another increase of another 100 million.

Seventy-one percent of our population today lives in cities or urban centers. In another 20 years we will have about 70 million more persons living in our congested cities. Unless a program similar to the model cities under consideration today is approved, our relief rolls, discontent, illiteracy, unemployment will grow and the progress of our Nation

will eventually be curtailed and law enforcement jeopardized.

The time to start solving these great problems for our future prosperity and preservation of our free Government is now. A vote today to curtail this program by over 50 percent is not a vote for economy but it is a vote submitting to reckless politics. Our cities during the last few years has been a victim of riots, uprisings, and general discontent by the younger generation principally. Unless programs of this kind are sustained by our Congress, this general discontent of the underpaid, uneducated, unemployed will expand and grow, and the Nation and our Government will pay the penalty eventually.

I hope the Giaimo motion to sustain the Senate appropriation without curtailment will be sustained.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks on the model cities program at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

In response to the argument made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] wherein he alleged that there was a growing need for this extra \$300 million predicated on some of the riots and civil disturbances we have had, I would merely say we have had another change since May 17, 1967, which ought to influence Members on the vote today.

On May 17, when the House voted 213 to 193 to sustain the figure in the House version, \$237 million, it was a close vote between \$237 million and nothing, actually between \$237 million and \$12 million.

In the interval since May 17, when that vote was taken, until today, we have had a totally different picture presented to us so far as the fiscal situation of the Federal Government is concerned.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on May 17 were still alleging that we were going to have a deficit of \$8.1 billion. Today, October 24, they freely concede that the deficit of the Federal Government is going to be from \$24 billion to \$30 billion. We have had a significant shift in how our Federal Treasury is operating, in the interval conditions have gone from bad, to worse, to deadly serious.

I think one has to weigh the deterioration of the fiscal situation of the Federal Government on the one hand against the problems raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts on the other.

It seems to me that a vote today to increase the House figure by \$300 million will have a most adverse effect on the situation as far as the Treasury is concerned. I do not think it will significantly change the problems in the big



cities that occurred in the last 3 or 4 months. I know that there may be some—and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does not fall in this category—who favor the solution to the problems of Detroit and Newark and so forth by saying the way to correct the problem is to double, triple, or quadruple the amount of money coming from the Federal Treasury. That is not the answer. Three hundred million dollars of obligatory authority on this occasion will not solve those problems of the big cities. But a reduction in expenditures could be very helpful in helping to solve the problem which we face as a nation in the fiscal mess that we are in.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I listen with interest always to the distinguished minority leader.

I do not think anyone contends action on the part of the Federal Government will save all of our cities and will solve all of the problems consonant with all of our cities, but there has to be leadership on the part of the Federal Government. I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me that we are getting that kind of leadership by bringing into the ghetto areas some indication on the part of business that they are willing to contribute and to do their part to lift the burdens of the cities about the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to that, Congress last year made available \$11 billion in planning money for this agency to get the demonstration cities program off the ground. It is my best information that as of today—almost 12 months later—they have not disbursed one penny of that money. How can they properly absorb the additional money included in the House version of \$237 million much less the \$537 million included in the Senate version? It seems to me that that agency's record of performance is so poor that we should not trust them with an extra \$300 million over and above the \$237 million that the House has allocated. Therefore, I hope and trust that the Members will vote "no," so that we will stand by the \$237 million figure included in the House version.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gaiamo motion to agree to the Senate amount of \$537 million for the model cities program.

I might say to the distinguished minority leader that an appropriation bill for military construction will be before us shortly where he can easily save \$300 million if he really wants to, or a great deal more. However, the minority party should not save money at the expense of our cities, which is just what

the minority leader proposes to do. It is urgent that we face up to the problems which confront us in our urban areas. The proposal of the Senate to fund this program at \$537 million will only begin to meet the needs.

Earlier this afternoon the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices pointed out the recommendations of the House conferees would amount to three-quarters of a billion dollars in reductions below the budget estimate; \$756 million. I might point out that \$689 million, or 90 percent, of that reduction comes out of the funding of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. And out of the \$689 million reduction, some \$425 million comes out of the model cities programs.

So the model cities program and the rent supplement program, which will come up later, have been the principal victims of the budget slashes. If we are serious about our concerns about disorder in our cities which were expressed so often on the floor of the House last summer, it is important that we begin now to fund this program which was enacted by the Congress last year in order to deal with the very, very serious problems which have been permitted to fester over a long period of time. The time to start is now.

When the House reduced the Housing and Urban Development budget estimates by some \$689 million last May 17, the administration request was already \$599 million below available authorizations. In conference the House conferees yielded and agreed to increase its figures by only \$19.3 million, or less than 3 percent, while the Senate conferees yielded \$416 million—if we use the House figure on model cities and rent supplements.

The Bureau of the Budget estimates

that, if the recent Whitten and Bow amendment restrictions on overall expenditures stand, programs in housing and urban development will be cut back by another half billion dollars. It was reported yesterday that as a consequence of these steps, most of FHA's special assistance programs have been suspended, including special assistance for urban renewal, cooperative housing, housing for the elderly, and other low-income programs.

The mood of this House to chop away the major portions of critical domestic programs has lost any logical relation to war spending or to the size of the projected deficit. It has taken on a logic all its own. When the House reduces spending for a program or an agency millions of dollars below an already reduced administration request, it is not dealing in sterile mathematical calculation, but in people's lives.

Compared with the enormity of the crisis in our cities, the administration program—even if every last dollar of available authority were appropriated—constitutes a woeful minimum. If the administration were able to go ahead with its \$662 million model cities program, some 60 or 70 cities would receive an average of \$10 million each, a sum entirely inadequate to the problem. The entire administration rent supplements request would provide some 45,000 units throughout the Nation, when there are half a million substandard units in New York City alone; and no single State could have over 6,750 units because of the 15 percent limitation.

And yet, this House has seen fit to rip this minimal program to shreds. I have prepared a table on the fate of certain housing programs, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

[In millions of dollars]

	Authoriza- tion	Administra- tion request	House appro- priation	Conference report
Neighborhood facilities.....	121	42	27	30
Rehabilitation loans.....	100	0	0	0
Housing for the elderly loans.....	95	80	20	25
Urban planning grants.....	84	50	40	45
Metropolitan development incentive grants.....	50	30	0	0
Urban mass transportation.....	205	175	175	175
Community development training grants.....	30	5	2.5	3
Open space.....	20	20	5	10
Alaska housing program.....	125	125	75	75
Urban information and technical assistance.....	10	1	0	0
Model cities.....	8	6	2	2.2
Rent supplement.....	662	662	237	(1)
	40	40	0	(1)

<sup>1</sup> In disagreement.

To summarize briefly, let us look at histories of certain critically important programs: For example, neighborhood facilities authorizations total \$121 million; the administration request was only \$42 million; the House slashed this further to \$27 million, and the conference restored only \$3 million.

An authorization of \$100 million for rehabilitation loans was scrapped entirely by the administration.

Housing for the elderly was reduced from \$95 million to \$80 million by the administration. The House cut this back to \$20 million, and only \$5 million was restored in conference.

Funds for urban mass transportation

were slashed by \$30 million, and the conference accepted the House figures.

The open-space program was reduced by \$50 million, and Federal participation limited to 50 percent. The conference likewise accepted the House figures.

And so on for over a dozen critical urban programs.

The most devastating reductions occur in rent supplements and model cities. The Federal Government has been subsidizing housing for more than 30 years; and with costs rising and the degrading conditions of slums worsening, it cannot cease to do this now.

The rent supplements program was envisioned as a means to permit this

subsidy to operate to stimulate the market mechanism. It has been widely hailed as a creative means of increasing the supply of moderate-income housing. The \$40 million request which this House rejected would barely make a dent on our housing needs.

Similarly, the model cities program, as modest as it is, provides the beginning of comprehensive planning to restore blighted areas of our urban centers. And last May 17 the House saw fit to reduce the funds requested available for this program by approximately 64 percent.

Those actions were taken before the massive civil disorders of this summer, which are symptomatic of the enormity of the problem. Those riots might have been expected to move the Congress to action. Instead, they produced a perverse logic of "punishment," which would deny the funds to begin to eliminate the degradation of America's decaying core cities.

Let us exercise more wisdom than we did 5 months ago. Even with restored funds in model cities and rent supplements, authorized programs to aid our cities would be cut by nearly half. The cities have been shortchanged for too long. Our aid should not be halved, it should be doubled. As a beginning, I urge the House to agree to the Senate amount.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House bill included \$237 million for the model cities program, and the vote on which this question will be taken will be whether or not to increase it by the sum of \$300 million and accept the position of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I move to sustain the position of the House on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question and urge that you vote against the preferential motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will a vote for the Glaimo motion be a vote for a greater sum of money for the model cities program?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that a vote for the Glaimo motion is a vote for receding and concurring in the Senate amendment, which is the same thing.

Mr. YATES. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Glaimo] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 58 and No. 59, and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 241, not voting 35, as follows:

## [Roll No. 336]

## YEAS—156

Adams	Barrett	Brasco
Addabbo	Bingham	Brooks
Albert	Boland	Burke, Mass.
Annunzio	Bolling	Burton, Calif.
Ashley	Brademas	Byrne, Pa.

Carey	Harvey	O'Hara, Mich.
Celler	Hathaway	Olsen
Clark	Hawkins	O'Neill, Mass.
Cohen	Hechler, W. Va.	Otinger
Conyers	Heckler, Mass.	Patman
Cowger	Helstoski	Patten
Culver	Hicks	Pepper
Daddario	Hollifield	Perkins
Daniels	Holland	Price, Ill.
Dawson	Horton	Pucinski
de la Garza	Howard	Rees
Delaney	Irwin	Reuss
Dent	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Donohue	Karsten	Rodino
Dow	Karsh	Rogers, Colo.
Downing	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Dulski	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Eckhardt	Kee	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, Calif.	Kelly	Rosenthal
Eilberg	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Esch	Kirwan	Ryan
Evans, Colo.	Kluczyński	St Germain
Farbstein	Kupferman	Satterfield
Fascell	Kyros	Scheuer
Feighan	Leggett	Schweiker
Flood	Long, Md.	Sisk
Ford	McCarthy	Stafford
William D.	McDade	Staggers
Fraser	McCall	Stratton
Friedel	Machen	Sullivan
Fulton, Pa.	Madden	Tenzer
Fulton, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Gallagher	Meeds	Tiernan
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Tunney
Glaimo	Minish	Udall
Gibbons	Mink	Van Deerlin
Gilbert	Monagan	Vanik
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Vigorito
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Waldie
Green, Pa.	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Griffiths	Moss	Wilson
Gude	Multer	Charles H.
Halpern	Murphy, Ill.	Wolff
Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates
Hanna	Nedzi	Young
Hansen, Wash.	Nix	Zablocki
Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.	

## NAYS—241

Abbott	Corbett	Henderson
Abernethy	Cramer	Hosmer
Adair	Cunningham	Hull
Anderson, Ill.	Curtis	Hungate
Anderson, Tenn.	Davis, Ga.	Hunt
Andrews, Ala.	Davis, Wis.	Hutchinson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dellenback	Ichord
Arends	Denney	Jarman
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.
Ashmore	Devine	Jonas
Ayres	Dickinson	Jones, Ala.
Baring	Dole	Jones, N.C.
Battin	Dorn	Keith
Belcher	Dowdy	King, N.Y.
Bennett	Duncan	Kornegay
Berry	Dwyer	Kuykendall
Betts	Edmondson	Laird
Bevill	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
Blester	Edwards, La.	Langen
Blackburn	Erlenborn	Latta
Blanton	Eshleman	Lennon
Bolton	Everett	Lippscomb
Bow	Evins, Tenn.	Lloyd
Bray	Fallon	Lukens
Brinkley	Findley	McClure
Brock	Fino	McDonald,
Brotzman	Fisher	Mich.
Brown, Mich.	Flynt	McEwen
Brown, Ohio	Foley	McMillan
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	MacGregor
Broyhill, Va.	Fountain	Mahon
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Mailliard
Burke, Fla.	Fuqua	Marsh
Burleson	Galifianakis	Martin
Burton, Utah	Gardner	Mathias, Calif.
Bush	Gathings	May
Byrnes, Wis.	Goodell	Mayne
Cabell	Goodling	Meskill
Cahill	Gray	Michel
Carter	Gross	Miller, Ohio
Casey	Grover	Minshall
Cederberg	Gubser	Mize
Chamberlain	Gurney	Montgomery
Clancy	Hagan	Moore
Clausen	Haley	Morris, N. Mex.
Don H.	Hall	Morton
Clawson, Del.	Halleck	Mosher
Cleveland	Hamilton	Myers
Collier	Hammer-	Natcher
Colmer	schmidt	Nelsen
Conable	Hansen, Idaho	Nichols
Conte	Harrison	O'Konski
	Harsha	O'Neal, Ga.
	Hays	Passman

Pelly	Saylor	Teague, Tex.
Pettis	Schadeberg	Thompson, Ga.
Pickle	Scherle	Thomson, Wis.
Pike	Schneebell	Tuck
Pirnie	Schwengel	Ullman
Poff	Scott	Vander Jagt
Pollock	Selden	Waggonner
Pool	Shipley	Walker
Price, Tex.	Shriver	Wampler
Pryor	Sikes	Watkins
Quie	Skubitz	Watson
Quillen	Slack	Watts
Railsback	Smith, Calif.	Whalley
Randall	Smith, Iowa	White
Reid, Ill.	Smith, Okla.	Whitener
Reifel	Snyder	Whitten
Reinecke	Springer	Widnall
Rhodes, Ariz.	Stanton	Wiggins
Rivers	Steed	Williams, Pa.
Roberts	Steiger, Ariz.	Wilson, Bob
Robison	Steiger, Wis.	Winn
Rogers, Fla.	Stephens	Wright
Roth	Stubblefield	Wyatt
Roudebush	Stuckey	Wylder
Roush	Taft	Wylie
Rumsfeld	Talcott	Wyman
Ruppe	Taylor	Zion
Sandman	Teague, Calif.	Zwach

## NOT VOTING—35

Aspinall	Herlong	Philbin
Bates	Jacobs	Poage
Bell	Jones, Mo.	Purcell
Blatnik	Kleppe	Rarick
Boggs	Kyl	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Long, La.	Resnick
Brown, Calif.	McClory	Roybal
Button	McCulloch	St. Onge
Corman	Macdonald,	Smith, N.Y.
Diggs	Mass.	Utt
Gettys	Mathias, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Hébert	Mills	Willis

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Gettys against.  
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. McClory against.  
Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Broomfield against.  
Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Herlong against.  
Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Kleppe against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Kyl against.  
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Ashley with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Blatnick with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Jacobs.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. SCOTT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 58 and No. 59.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: On page 38, line 25, strike out "Provided, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for incurring or discharging:" and insert "Provided, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased



by \$40,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many in the House who will say that the gentleman from Illinois has moved in where angels fear to tread. However, Mr. Speaker, I am strengthened by the knowledge that I am in good company.

I keep company with Mr. Conservative himself—Republican Members may want to hear this—I keep company with the late Senator from the State of Ohio, the former minority leader of the other body, Senator Robert A. Taft. Together, Mr. Speaker, we appeal to the conscience of the House, for that is what is involved in the amendment that is under consideration at the present time—the conscience of the House.

This is an amendment which seeks to provide funds for the poor, for the sick, for the disabled, for the dispossessed, for every group that is at the bottom of the economic ladder in our country at a time when others are enjoying record prosperity.

The question is raised, Mr. Speaker, by many as to why should we pay a portion of the rent of our neighbors. Well, let us see what Senator Taft had to say about this, for his arguments are logical and persuasive. He said this when there was under consideration in the other body the question of the public housing program:

The American people are a charitable people, and are a humane people. They do not want to see hardship and poverty in the midst of plenty.

He said:

This requires a tax on the other four-fifths of the people, perhaps the other three-fifths of the people, to pay most of the taxes, but I believe these people are willing to pay the tax in order to accomplish the purpose of seeing that we no longer have any serious problem of hardship and poverty in the United States and that the children of all the families in the United States have an equal opportunity or a substantially equal opportunity to get started in life and that if they have the abilities to make use of them to the full extent they can so that the United States may remain a country of free opportunity.

And that argument is applicable, too, in the motion under consideration at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we keep in mind the people who are to be

benefited by this program. Who are they? This is not a windfall for a favored group. It is for the underprivileged. It is applicable only to the people who can qualify for public housing. Nobody who has an income above the limits established for public housing can obtain rent supplements under this program. In addition to that basic qualification, Mr. Speaker, what others exist? Secondly, the program is for elderly people. In addition to the fact that their incomes are limited to those of public housing qualification, they must be over the age of 62; or they must be handicapped people with a physical handicap; or they must be displaced people—they must be evicted as a result of some governmental action. Or, they must be slum dwellers; they must live in ghettos or live in substandard dwellings; or they must be disaster refugees, those who have been displaced by storms or floods or hurricanes such as the people in the State of Texas recently suffered.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only ones who can qualify under this program. These are the poor, the elderly, the sick, the displaced. The people, in short, who need our help. That is why I say that this is a matter that tries the conscience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I shall be very glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has made the statement that only the people living in those categories which he has previously mentioned are eligible to live in the facilities that would be built under this program.

Is that a matter of law or regulation?

Mr. YATES. That is a matter of both law and regulation, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. It is a matter of law in establishing the level of income and of the regulations in conjunction with other qualifications.

So that by both law and regulations these people, and only these groups at the present time are qualified to live in facilities for which rent supplements are directed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I comment upon the gentleman's observation. Will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield further?

Mr. YATES. I shall be glad to yield further to the distinguished minority leader, [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, I believe is accurate in what he has said. It is a matter of both law and regulation.

Mr. YATES. Right.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. By law, the Congress has given to the administrative agencies the right to establish criteria, and by law they can do so by regulations. But, Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the

United States has not written any guidelines such as the gentleman from Illinois has described for the occupancy of the units. Those guidelines are written by agency regulations and these regulations could be changed tomorrow.

Mr. YATES. That does not make any difference. Even if that were true, the law as it stands today is as I reported it to the House, I still insist that it is a matter for the conscience of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], in this regard.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is very persuasive in his advocacy of this matter. However, I still think the better position for us to take on this occasion today is to reject the Senate \$40 million figure so that the conferees can bargain from a position of strength. The House should not capitulate to the Senate and the President.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, that position would represent a vote against Americans who need help. The gentleman from Michigan is rejecting the position espoused by former Senator Taft—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further I do not think this rent subsidy program was even a gleam in the eye of Senator Taft in 1948. And, let me say this in furtherance of my statement—

Mr. YATES. Let me say further, first, that the program to which the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft, was addressing himself was one of housing totally subsidized by the Government. Certainly he would favor and support a housing program which would be carried out by private industry.

Can the distinguished gentleman from Michigan imagine the fact that the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, would not be for this kind of a program?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further? Let me say that if Senator Taft were here today—and I am sure that perhaps his distinguished son would be a better spokesman than I on the views of the former distinguished Senator—I am sure that the former distinguished Senator, Senator Taft, would take into consideration the fact that under the public housing program the Government of the United States has expended some \$5 billion and with many disappointments as to its effectiveness. Today the people who advocate rent supplements are using the same arguments that were used 20 years ago for public housing, while the expenditure of the sum of \$5 billion for public housing has not done the job.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has just admitted my point. It is his opinion and mine that the former distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, would be supporting this program. Therefore, the arguments upon his behalf to provide for this program, he would have been against?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman willing to do away with the

\$275 million which is contained in this bill with which to subsidize the public housing program and to call for the advocacy of a new program while abandoning public housing? It is my opinion that rent supplements may have many advantages over public housing, but why does not the gentleman take some of the \$275 million which is contained in the public housing program and put it into this rent subsidy program or, even better, into the rent certificate program.

Mr. YATES. I say to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], that the poor are with us and that they will continue to be with us. This program is a step in the right direction and deserves our support.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me make this observation. The gentleman talks about the poor, and as I understand the agency regulations that we have for this program, people who have outside assets of up to \$25,000 can still qualify. Is that correct?

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman that is wrong. It may have been true at one time, but it was corrected.

I remember that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] so argued at one time, but subsequently, after correction, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] favors this program, unless I am mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman what are the income limitations that apply to the rent supplements? How much money can a person have under the regulations in outside income, and still qualify for the rent supplement?

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman from New Hampshire that the income ceilings vary from community to community. What is the limitation for New York may not be the limitation for one of the cities in the gentleman's district in New Hampshire, or for other small cities. But generally it depends upon the cost of living in the particular city.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I believe we would have to refer back to the limitations under the amendment that I offered that only those people who are eligible for public housing projects are eligible for rent supplements.

Mr. YATES. That is what I said.

Mr. STEPHENS. That is the law, and it is not a regulation.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Georgia tell us what the figure is?

Mr. STEPHENS. It would be that which applies to the community under consideration under the law. I can tell the gentleman what it would be in my community.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is right; it varies from community to community.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What is the highest figure? Will somebody please tell us what the highest figure is?

Does not anybody know who justifies this program? I cannot imagine that.

Mr. STEPHENS. It is the same as the highest figure in public housing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. Mr. Speaker, the income limitation, as I stated varies from community to community.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to vote against this preferential motion, but the gentleman from Michigan and some others have now made me wonder if my position is correct.

The distinguished minority leader asked the question whether anyone could tell us the figure for the bottom limit and the highest limit. And the argument may be that the limit is too high. Can the gentleman tell us what the limit is?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The last time we had a figure given on the floor of the House by the proponents of the rent subsidy program it was said the tenants could have outside capital asset accumulations of up to \$25,000, and I have seen no one deny that or give us an alternative figure. If the situation is different I believe we ought to have some information on this from the proponents of the rent subsidy program at this time.

Can they give us this information?

Mr. HAYS. Or, if not, can the opponents tell us?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in an endeavor to put this matter in proper perspective, let me say that the President recommended in his budget \$40 million in contract authority for the second full year of the rent supplement program. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$10 million when the bill came before the House on May 17, the subcommittee recommended \$10 million—and the full committee recommended \$10 million. The House voted down the \$10 million rent supplement by a 61 majority in a record vote.

The Senate has recommended the full budget request of \$40 million.

Personally, I feel that the rent supplement program should be given an opportunity to work. The gentleman from Michigan and others have said we have appropriated from \$265 million to \$275 million a year on public housing.

This rent supplement program is a new approach, this is a new concept.

This is a private enterprise concept. Public housing is Government owned, Government controlled, Government managed, and Government subsidized. We have been in the public housing business for more than 25 years, and now here is a new approach, here is a program to substitute private capital for the public funds. Here is the possibility of an alternative to public housing keyed to the free enterprise concept.

Projects built under the rent supplement program are privately owned, privately managed, and privately controlled.

This program has the broad support of our mayors and other city officials, many churches and charitable institutions, and the strong support of the housing sector of our private economy, including the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders, as well as the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Council of the Aging, and many other church, business, and charitable organizations.

I repeat: Public housing is government owned, government built, government operated, government managed, and not on the tax rolls.

Rent supplement housing is privately built, privately financed, privately owned, privately managed, and the property is on the local tax rolls.

Many people feel that this is a better approach and a better concept than public housing.

Since the committee acted on May 17, private insurance companies have committed a billion dollars to assist in providing low-rent housing in our cities. They recognize the problems of the cities and the ghettos and they recognize that something must be done about these problems. The insurance companies feel that the rent supplement program is a sound proposition and they are recommending a billion dollars to be committed for housing in our cities.

I might say that they are expecting the Government to show some expression of good faith in this program. Congress has approved the program—it is underway—it should be given a fair trial.

In addition, the law provides that no rent supplement program will be approved unless the local community approves it.

I cannot see in view of the need for housing why we cannot give private enterprise an opportunity to participate in low-rent housing programs, and I believe that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, will agree with me that our hearings convinced us all that this approach was better than public housing.

I have brought this back in disagreement because of the House vote against it. I favor going back to conference to try to work out an agreement on some level of funding to continue the rent supplement program that now stands in wide disagreement between the House figure of zero and the Senate figure of \$40,000,000.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee wants it to be understood by the House that he supports his own motion but that he opposes the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois. His own motion will take this back to conference where there will be an opportunity to have a meeting of the minds and get closer together than we are as of right now.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say that if anybody wants to vote for the \$40,000,000, that is his privilege.

Mr. JONAS. I hope that that is not true. A vote for the preferential motion would be a vote—

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. A vote for the preferential motion would be to vote for \$40,000,000 and so get together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 more minutes to give the Members of the House some additional facts.

Mr. Speaker, the \$32,000,000 previously provided for the rent supplement program has all been committed and allocated. This covers 451 projects in 304 cities in 47 States. This includes a total of 47,677 units, of which 15,313 are supplemental.

What I have just given you is the current status of the rent supplement program.

I now want to give you a picture of requests for the future that cannot be funded.

As of October 20, Friday, of last week, HUD had applications on file for \$13,543,000 in rent supplements in projects for which funds are not available. These involve 148 projects in 123 cities in 32 States. This backlog includes 15,352 units—of which 15,313 would be supplemental.

I am advised that another \$7 million in applications have not reached Washington.

And so the need is pressing—the need must be met.

This program offers prospects of playing an important role in the providing of housing for our cities, large and small.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. In response to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, I would point out that the asset limitation for eligibility for rent supplements is \$2,000, and \$5,000 for elderly people, I think the gentleman used the figure of \$25,000. That is way out of line. The asset limitation is \$2,000 and it increases if the individual is in the elderly category to \$5,000.

With reference to the income limitation, as the gentleman from Georgia explained, it is different in different sections of the country depending on what the cost of living might be in a particu-

lar area. As you know it has been the highest in New York City. My understanding is that there is a limitation there of about \$6,100 for a family of a mother, father, and five or more children. The income limitation there could be about \$6,100.

Mr. Speaker, in further response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], the hearings indicate that the asset limitations are \$2,000 on a family and \$5,000 for the elderly and handicapped. This is total outside assets—liquid and nonliquid. It also includes the cash value of life insurance policies.

With respect to income limitations, the law provides that the income of persons whose rents are to be supplemented can not exceed the limits for public housing—low-income housing. And those income limits for public housing are established by the local housing authorities subject to HUD review and approval. These income limitations are not, of course, the same in every geographical area. Income limitations are higher in high-cost areas. I will supply for the RECORD a table showing income limits for rent supplement housing and for section 221(h) rehabilitation sales housing for low-income purchasers. I note that the highest income figure on the list is \$6,100 for a family of seven or more and that area is New York City.

The table referred to follows:

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
<b>Alabama:</b>							
Birmingham	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,600	\$3,600	\$3,800	\$3,800	\$3,800
Florence	2,400	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Huntsville	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Mobile	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Montgomery	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
Ozark	2,900	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Tuscaloosa	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Anniston	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,500
Bessemer	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400	4,500
Decatur	2,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500
Dothan	2,600	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800
Phenix City	2,600	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900
Prichard	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Selma	3,000	3,500	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
<b>Alaska:</b>							
Anchorage	4,600	5,200	5,800	6,200	6,400	6,400	6,400
Fairbanks	4,400	4,800	5,600	5,800	6,200	6,400	6,400
Juneau	4,800	5,400	6,000	6,400	6,400	6,400	6,400
<b>Arizona:</b>							
Phoenix	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Tucson	3,000	3,000	3,400	3,400	3,700	3,700	3,700
Eloy	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,900	3,900	3,900
Mesa	2,600	2,600	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
McNary	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Winslow	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	3,800
Whiteriver	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Window Rock	2,800	3,400	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Flagstaff	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000
<b>Arkansas:</b>							
Batesville	2,800	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Blytheville	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,600	3,600	3,600
Fort Smith	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Little Rock	3,120	3,120	4,120	4,120	5,280	5,280	5,280
North Little Rock	3,000	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Pine Bluff	2,700	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
West Memphis	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Hot Springs	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Russellville	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
<b>California:</b>							
Altadena	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Bakersfield	2,800	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000
Beaumont	2,800	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Compton	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Fresno	2,600	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Long Beach	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Los Angeles	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Modesto	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Napa	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
<b>California—Continued</b>							
Oakland	\$3,300	\$3,800	\$4,300	\$4,700	\$5,100	\$5,500	\$5,900
Pittsburg	3,300	3,800	4,400	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700
Redlands	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,300
Richmond	3,700	3,700	4,100	4,100	4,400	4,400	4,400
Riverside	2,800	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Sacramento	3,300	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,400	4,500	4,600
San Bernardino	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,300
San Diego	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,600	4,600	4,600
San Francisco	3,200	4,000	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100
Santa Barbara	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,500	4,500	4,500
Santa Cruz	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,300	4,700	5,000	5,400
San Jose	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Santa Monica	3,000	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600
Stockton	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	4,200	4,200	4,200
Upland	3,000	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Vallejo	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Visalia	3,000	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Oxnard	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Eureka	3,000	3,300	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200
Salinas	2,800	3,400	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,400
San Buenaventura	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
<b>Colorado:</b>							
Canon City	2,800	3,100	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Denver	3,300	3,300	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,800
Pueblo	2,000	3,100	3,400	3,600	4,100	4,400	4,600
Thornton	3,300	3,300	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,800
Loveland	2,800	3,200	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,600
Boulder	3,200	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,500	4,700	5,100
<b>Connecticut:</b>							
Bridgport	3,600	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,600
Bridgeport	3,800	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Danbury	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Farmington	3,600	4,500	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,600	6,000
Greenwich	3,600	4,000	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,000
Hartford	3,900	4,200	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
Meriden	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,800	5,200
Middletown	3,600	3,900	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Milford	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
New Britain	3,500	4,200	4,700	5,200	5,500	5,800	6,100
New Haven	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Norwalk	3,600	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100	6,100
Norwich	3,500	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,400	5,700
Shelton	3,600	4,200	4,700	5,100	5,400	5,700	6,000
Stamford	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Waterbury	3,400	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
East Hartford	3,900	4,200	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
New London	3,600	4,200	4,700	5,000	5,400	5,700	6,100

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

State and locality	Number of persons in family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Connecticut—Continued							
Stratford.....	\$3,600	\$4,400	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,700
West Haven.....	3,600	4,500	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,700	5,900
Delaware:							
Dover.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Wilmington.....	3,100	3,100	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800
District of Columbia: Washing-							
ton.....	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Florida:							
Clearwater.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Collier County.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Daytona Beach.....	2,600	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,100
Fort Lauderdale.....	3,000	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,500
Fort Myers.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,100
Gainesville.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300
Jacksonville.....	2,600	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Lake City.....	2,700	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Miami.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Miami Beach.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Panama City.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Pensacola.....	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	3,900
St. Petersburg.....	2,900	3,000	3,200	3,300	3,600	3,700	3,800
Tallahassee.....	2,800	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,200
Tampa.....	3,200	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
West Palm Beach.....	3,000	4,200	4,300	4,400	4,500	4,600	4,700
Melbourne.....	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Gifford.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Merritt Island.....	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,200	4,300	4,400
Opa Locka.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Fort Pierce.....	2,500	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,700
Key West.....	4,200	4,200	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,600
Lakeland.....	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,500
Sarasota.....	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,100	3,100	3,100
Georgia:							
Albany.....	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Athens.....	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Atlanta.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,400
Augusta.....	2,400	3,200	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Cartersville.....	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000
Columbus.....	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Decatur.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Gainesville.....	3,200	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Hampton.....	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900
Macon.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Savannah.....	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,400
Waycross.....	2,900	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,100
Americus.....	2,400	3,000	3,200	3,300	3,600	3,700	3,800
Millen.....	3,000	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
East Point.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,400
Marietta.....	2,400	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Rome.....	2,200	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,400	3,700	3,800
Valdosta.....	2,800	3,900	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300
Hawaii:							
Honolulu.....	4,000	4,200	4,700	4,700	5,300	5,300	5,500
Halawa.....	4,000	4,200	4,700	4,700	5,300	5,300	5,500
Hilo.....	3,500	3,700	4,200	4,200	4,800	4,800	5,000
Idaho: Boise.....							
Boise.....	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Illinois:							
Cairo.....	2,400	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Carbondale.....	2,800	4,000	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,300
Champaign.....	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Chicago.....	3,000	4,200	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Decatur.....	2,500	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,600
East Chicago Heights.....	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,600
East St. Louis.....	2,800	3,800	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Joliet.....	3,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Oakbrook.....	3,000	4,200	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,200	5,400
Pekin.....	3,000	3,600	3,900	3,900	4,200	4,200	4,200
Peoria.....	3,000	4,000	4,900	4,900	5,000	5,000	5,000
Richwoods Township (Peoria County).....	3,000	4,000	4,900	4,900	5,000	5,000	5,000
Rockford.....	3,000	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700	6,000
Rock Island.....	2,800	3,800	4,600	4,100	5,500	5,700	6,000
Springfield.....	2,600	3,400	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,000
Waukegan.....	3,000	4,300	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,800
Bloomington.....	2,900	4,400	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,600
Danville.....	2,600	4,000	4,500	5,000	5,300	5,500	5,800
Freeport.....	2,500	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,400
Granite City.....	3,000	3,800	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500
Chicago Heights.....	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,600
Moline.....	2,800	3,800	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,100	5,300
Quincy.....	2,800	3,100	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Urbana.....	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Indiana:							
Bremen.....	2,800	3,800	4,200	4,300	4,700	4,800	4,900
Columbus.....	2,900	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Elkhart.....	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
Evansville.....	2,500	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,250	4,500
Fort Wayne.....	2,800	3,900	4,300	4,600	4,800	4,900	5,000
Gary.....	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,500	5,800	6,000
Hammond.....	3,000	4,300	4,600	5,000	5,200	5,400	5,700
Indianapolis.....	2,900	3,800	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Jeffersonville.....	2,600	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,800
Michigan City.....	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,500	4,600
Mishawaka.....	2,800	4,200	4,500	5,000	5,300	5,500	5,800
Muncie.....	2,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
New Albany.....	2,800	3,600	3,800	4,150	4,350	4,550	4,700
South Bend.....	3,000	3,800	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Terre Haute.....	2,400	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300
Vincennes.....	2,800	4,400	4,850	5,100	5,300	5,500	5,700
Goshen.....	3,000	4,400	4,800	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
Bloomington.....	2,500	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800
Kokomo.....	2,600	3,800	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,800	4,900
Iowa:							
Cedar Rapids.....	\$2,600	\$3,600	\$3,700	\$3,800	\$3,900	\$4,000	\$4,100
Denison.....	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Des Moines.....	2,600	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Eagle Grove.....	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Garner.....	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Sioux City.....	2,000	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Walnut.....	2,700	3,300	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
West Des Moines.....	2,700	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Rockwell City.....	2,700	3,300	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100
Kansas:							
Kansas City.....	3,400	3,900	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200	5,300
Topeka.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Wichita.....	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000
Kentucky:							
Covington.....	3,000	4,400	4,900	5,200	5,400	5,500	5,600
Frankfort.....	2,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Fulton.....	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100
Lexington.....	3,000	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	4,900
Louisville.....	2,400	2,950	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Paducah.....	2,800	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,400	4,500	4,600
Bowling Green.....	2,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600
Henderson.....	2,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,500
Newport.....	2,800	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,600	4,700	4,800
Owensboro.....	2,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Hopkinsville.....	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Louisiana:							
Batchelor.....	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Baton Rouge.....	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,300
Lafayette.....	3,000	3,000	3,800	3,800	4,600	4,600	4,600
Lake Charles.....	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100	3,100
Morganza.....	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
New Orleans.....	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
New Roads.....	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Pineville.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Ponchatoula.....	2,400	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Shreveport.....	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Simmesport.....	2,400	3,100	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700
Vinton.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800
Westwego.....	2,700	2,700	3				



INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

Number of persons in family

State and locality

1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

Minnesota:							
Austin	\$3,100	\$3,500	\$4,100	\$4,200	\$4,400	\$4,600	\$4,800
Duluth	2,800	3,500	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600
Elk River	3,000	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,150	4,400	4,700
Glenwood	2,700	3,100	3,400	3,700	3,900	4,200	4,500
Litchfield	2,800	3,300	3,500	3,750	4,000	4,250	4,500
Minneapolis	2,400	3,300	4,300	4,300	4,800	4,800	4,800
Montevideo	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
St. Cloud	2,600	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
St. Paul	2,800	3,200	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Thief River Falls	2,600	3,100	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Rochester	3,400	3,800	4,400	4,800	5,000	5,400	5,800
Mississippi:							
Biloxi	2,600	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Canton	2,500	3,300	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900
Greenville	2,600	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Gulfport	3,100	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Jackson	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Meridian	2,600	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000
Mound Bayou	2,300	2,800	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800
Hattiesburg	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,700	4,000	4,100	4,200
Laurel	2,900	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,100	4,200	4,300
Vicksburg	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Missouri:							
Concordia	3,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,700	4,900
Independence	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Kansas City	3,500	3,500	4,100	4,100	4,600	4,600	4,600
St. Louis	3,900	3,900	5,000	5,000	6,100	6,100	6,100
Kinloch	3,600	3,600	4,200	4,200	4,700	4,700	4,700
Columbia	3,105	3,105	3,450	3,450	3,795	3,795	3,795
Jefferson City	2,700	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Montana:							
Billings	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Glendive	2,900	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800
Great Falls	2,800	3,400	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,200
Plentywood	2,900	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800
Butte	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Nebraska:							
Lincoln	2,600	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400
Omaha	2,400	4,000	5,600	4,600	5,200	5,200	5,200
Nevada:							
Las Vegas	4,000	4,000	4,300	4,300	4,700	4,700	4,700
Reno	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,700	4,700	4,700
New Hampshire:							
Manchester	3,800	3,800	4,600	4,600	4,800	4,800	5,200
Nashua	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,000	4,000	4,500
Portsmouth	3,500	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200	5,400
New Jersey:							
Asbury Park	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Atlantic City	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,900
Bayonne	4,000	4,500	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800	6,000
Bridgeton	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Camden	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,400	4,400
East Orange	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Elizabeth	3,600	4,400	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,500	5,800
Hackensack	3,600	4,200	4,600	4,800	5,200	5,200	5,400
Irvine	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,000
Jersey City	4,000	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,800
Lakewood	3,400	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Newark	3,600	4,200	4,380	4,560	4,740	4,920	5,100
Passaic	3,100	4,100	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,800
Paterson	3,700	4,100	4,500	4,900	5,300	5,700	6,100
Perth Amboy	3,800	4,100	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Rahway	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,100
Trenton	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Union	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Woodbridge	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,100
Carleer	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Hoboken	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Long Branch	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,400	4,600	4,800
New Brunswick	3,600	4,200	4,600	5,200	5,400	5,600	5,800
North Bergen	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
Orange	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700	4,800
Plainfield	3,600	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
West New York	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,700	4,900	5,000	5,100
New Mexico:							
Albuquerque	2,800	3,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,300	4,400
Roswell	2,800	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Santa Fe	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Las Cruces	2,800	3,600	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Clovis	2,500	2,500	2,900	2,900	3,300	3,300	3,300
Las Vegas City	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
New York:							
Albany	3,400	3,800	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Auburn	3,000	3,700	4,400	4,600	5,000	5,400	5,800
Binghamton	3,200	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Buffalo	3,600	3,900	4,500	5,000	5,000	5,880	5,880
Newburgh	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,100	5,200	5,200	5,400
New York	3,888	5,256	5,760	5,760	6,100	6,100	6,100
Niagara Falls	3,300	3,500	3,700	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Ossining	3,600	4,600	5,200	5,400	5,700	5,900	6,100
Rochester	3,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,700	6,100
Rome	3,600	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400
Schenectady	3,500	4,000	4,250	4,500	5,250	5,500	5,500
Syracuse	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,500	5,000	5,500	6,000
Troy	4,200	4,200	4,500	4,500	4,800	4,800	5,100
Utica	3,600	4,200	4,900	5,100	5,300	5,500	5,700
Watertown	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000	4,600	4,600	4,800
Yonkers	3,600	4,700	5,000	5,400	5,600	5,800	6,100
Amsterdam	3,600	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Elmira	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,300
Freepoint	3,800	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400	5,800	6,100
Kingston	3,600	4,000	4,600	4,700	4,900	5,100	5,300
Lackawanna	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Long Beach	3,600	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,250	5,400

See footnote at end of table.

CXIII—1880—Part 22

Number of persons in family

State and locality

1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

North Carolina:							
Asheville	\$3,000	\$3,600	\$3,800	\$3,900	\$4,200	\$4,300	\$4,400
Charlotte	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	3,800
Durham	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Goldsboro	2,600	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,900	4,000	4,100
Greensboro	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
High Point	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Raleigh	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Salisbury	3,200	3,800	3,900	3,900	4,100	4,100	4,100
Wilmington	2,400	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,900
Winston-Salem	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,700
Fayetteville	2,600	3,500	3,700	3,800	4,200	4,300	4,400
Rocky Mount	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Wilson	2,400	2,900	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,500	3,600
North Dakota:							
Beach	2,600	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,500	4,800
Fargo	2,400	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Garrison	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Southwest Fargo	2,600	3,200	3,600	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,400
Ohio:							
Akron	2,800	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Canton	2,500	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Cincinnati	2,700	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Cleveland	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Columbus	2,500	3,700	4,100	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,200
Dayton	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Hamilton	2,700	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Lorain	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,900
Mansfield	2,400	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	4,800	5,100
Martins Ferry	2,600	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800	5,000
Mayfield Heights	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
New Boston	2,700	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Oberlin	2,600	4,400	4,700	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,900
Parma Heights	2,900	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Perrysburg	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Springfield	2,800	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900
Toledo	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Youngstown	2,500	3,700	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Steubenville	2,600	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800	5,000
Warren	2,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,900	5,200	5,500
Zanesville	2,200	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,500	4,800
Oklahoma:							
Enid	2,700	2,700	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,600
Eufaula	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Lawton	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Muskogee	2,500	2,700	2,900	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Oklahoma City	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,300
Tulsa	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Oregon:							
Corvallis	2,900	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Eugene	2,800	3,200	3,500	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000
Milwaukie	3,400	3,400	4,200	4,200	4,800	4,800	5,200
Portland	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	4,100	4,100	4,100
Salem	2,800	3,200	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Pennsylvania:							
Allentown	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800
Bethlehem	3,100	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Braddock	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Chambersburg	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Chester	3,200	3,740	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Easton	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800
Erie	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	4,200
Harrisburg	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Jenkintown	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,000
Johnstown	3,500	3,500	3,700	3,700	3,900	3,900	4,100
Lancaster	3,000	3,100	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Philadelphia	3,200	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000	4,000	4,200
Pittsburgh	3,400	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,600	4,600	4,800
Rankin	3,500	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,600	4,700
Reading	3,000	3,100	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	4,800
Scranton	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Swatara Township	3,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
York	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,700
Aliquippa	3,500	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,300	4,300	4,700
McKeesport	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000
New Castle	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,900	3,900	3,900
Ridley Township	3,200	3,500	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800
Puerto Rico: All localities except							
Ramey Air Force Base	1,750	2,125	2,500	2,875	3,000	3,125	3,250
Rhode Island:							
Cranston	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200
Newport	3,200	3,800	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000
Pawtucket	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,600	3,800	3,800	4,000
Providence	3,800	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000	5,200
Warwick	3,300	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100
Woonsocket	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,500	4,500	5,000
South Carolina:							
Charleston	3,000	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	4,700
Columbia	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600	3,600
Darlington	2,700	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,200
Greenville	3,000	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,500	4,600	4,700
Sumter	3,000	3,600	3,700	3,800	4,100	2,200	4,300
Georgetown	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Rock Hill	2,800	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,200	4,300
Spartanburg	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,400
South Dakota:							
Alcester	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Mitchell	2,600	3,200	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Pine Ridge	2,000	3,300	3,700	4,100	4,500	4,800	5,000
Spearfish	3,000	3,500	4,100	4,400	4,600	4,800	5,000

INCOME LIMITS FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT HOUSING AND FOR SEC. 221(h) REHABILITATION SALES HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME PURCHASERS, LIST NO. 5—Continued

State and locality	Number of persons in family					
	1	3	4	5	6	7+
<b>Tennessee:</b>						
Athens.....	\$2,400	\$3,300	\$3,500	\$3,700	\$3,900	\$4,100
Chattanooga.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Clarksville.....	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Clinton.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Cookeville.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,100	4,300
Dickson.....	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,000	4,200
Franklin.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Greenville.....	2,400	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300
Harriman.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Jackson.....	2,800	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Johnson City.....	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Knoxville.....	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,780	4,000	4,200
McMinnville.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Memphis.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Milan.....	3,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Morristown.....	3,000	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700
Nashville.....	3,300	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600
Pulaski.....	3,000	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500
Shelbyville.....	2,800	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Springfield.....	2,700	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	4,000
Cleveland.....	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Paris.....	2,400	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
Kingsport.....	3,000	3,900	4,100	4,300	4,500	4,700
<b>Texas:</b>						
Austin.....	2,500	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800
Beaumont.....	2,800	2,800	3,600	3,600	4,500	4,500
Big Spring.....	3,000	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,300
Bridgeport.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,800
Commerce.....	2,400	2,400	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000
Corpus Christi.....	2,800	2,800	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500
Dallas.....	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600
Denton.....	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,200
Diboll.....	3,200	3,800	4,300	4,500	4,700	4,900
Dublin.....	2,700	2,700	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,500
Edinburg.....	2,400	2,400	2,700	2,700	3,000	3,000
El Paso.....	3,250	3,550	3,750	3,950	4,150	4,350
Fort Worth.....	2,880	2,880	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000
Galveston.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,800
Henderson.....	3,000	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500
Houston.....	2,640	2,640	3,040	3,040	3,780	3,780
Laredo.....	2,800	3,200	3,400	3,400	3,600	3,600
Lubbock.....	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100
Mercedes.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,800
Mission.....	2,640	2,640	3,120	3,120	3,600	3,600
Orange.....	3,200	3,200	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000
Port Arthur.....	3,000	3,000	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000
San Angelo.....	2,500	2,800	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,900
San Antonio.....	3,100	3,350	3,600	3,600	3,850	3,850
Waco.....	2,800	2,800	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500
Wichita Falls.....	2,600	2,880	3,460	3,460	3,840	3,840
Corsicana.....	3,200	3,200	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000
Carthage.....	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	3,900
Denison.....	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600	4,000	4,000
Bryan.....	2,800	2,800	3,400	3,400	4,000	4,000
Crockett.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,700	3,900
Jefferson.....	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000
Baytown.....	2,500	2,500	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300
Brownsville.....	2,500	3,100	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,800
Greenville.....	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200
<b>Texas—Continued</b>						
Harlingen.....	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$3,000	\$3,000
Kingsville.....	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100
Longview.....	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
McAllen.....	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500
Temple.....	3,200	3,200	3,800	3,800	4,400	4,400
Texarkana.....	3,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000
Texas City.....	3,100	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,200	4,400
Victoria.....	2,600	2,600	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200
Gainesville.....	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300
Jacksonville.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,100	4,300
Troup.....	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Palestine.....	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Paris.....	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,800	3,100	3,100
Utah: Salt Lake City.....	2,800	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	4,000
Vermont: Burlington.....	3,600	4,000	4,300	4,600	4,800	5,200
<b>Virginia:</b>						
Alexandria.....	3,700	4,500	4,700	4,700	5,100	5,100
Charlottesville.....	3,000	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,400
Herndon.....	3,500	3,800	4,000	4,100	4,400	4,500
Lynchburg.....	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200
Newport News.....	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,600
Norfolk.....	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,800
Norton.....	2,600	3,200	3,400	3,600	3,800	4,000
Portsmouth.....	3,000	3,500	3,900	3,900	4,400	4,400
Richmond.....	3,100	3,100	3,400	3,400	3,700	3,700
Roanoke.....	3,300	3,330	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800
Danville.....	3,000	3,000	3,300	3,300	3,700	3,700
<b>Washington:</b>						
Everett.....	3,500	4,000	4,600	4,600	5,000	5,000
Kelso.....	3,300	4,000	4,700	4,900	5,200	5,600
Pasco.....	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	5,100
Seattle.....	3,000	4,000	4,700	4,700	5,200	5,200
Tacoma.....	3,000	3,500	4,325	4,500	4,800	5,500
Vancouver.....	2,800	3,100	3,500	3,800	4,200	4,900
Walla Walla.....	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300
Bremerton.....	3,800	3,800	4,200	4,200	4,700	4,700
Yakima.....	3,100	3,100	3,300	3,300	3,600	3,600
Stanwood.....	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200	4,500	5,000
<b>West Virginia:</b>						
Charleston.....	3,300	3,500	3,700	3,900	4,100	4,500
Huntington.....	2,700	2,700	2,900	2,900	3,200	3,200
Parkersburg.....	3,100	3,300	3,500	3,600	3,800	4,200
Wheeling.....	2,600	3,300	3,450	3,450	3,800	4,150
Fairmont.....	2,600	3,000	3,200	3,400	3,600	4,000
<b>Wisconsin:</b>						
Bloomer.....	2,550	3,700	4,050	4,250	4,450	4,900
Madison.....	2,600	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,600	5,000
Milwaukee.....	3,000	4,400	4,650	4,900	5,150	5,650
La Crosse.....	3,200	3,200	3,500	3,500	3,800	3,800
Superior.....	2,800	3,500	3,900	4,200	4,400	4,600
<b>Wyoming:</b>						
Casper.....	2,900	3,200	3,500	3,800	4,100	4,700
Cheyenne.....	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300
Cody.....	2,800	3,100	3,400	3,700	4,000	4,300
Powell.....	2,700	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200
Douglas.....	2,800	3,000	3,400	3,700	3,900	4,500
Laramie.....	3,000	3,400	3,800	4,200	4,500	5,100
Lusk.....	2,700	3,000	3,300	3,600	3,900	4,200
Torrington.....	2,800	3,000	3,300	3,600	4,100	4,400

1 To be established at a later date.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlemen from Georgia, a member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we seem to be debating a question that is not germane here. We seem to be debating a question as to whether or not we are going to vote for a rent subsidy in housing or not vote for a rent subsidy in housing. That is not the question at all. The question involved is this. We already have a rent subsidy in the form of public housing. We have had it for 30 years. The question is: How are we going to provide housing? Shall we continue that subsidy? Or are we going to provide a subsidy at less cost to the taxpayer? Are we going to continue the public housing subsidy at the taxpayer's expense to the extent of 100 percent of the amount, or are we going to turn to a rent subsidy that is at the expense of private enterprise?

The question is not whether we have a rent subsidy. We have a rent subsidy. And it is not going away. You must decide and then vote how, with the least

amount of expense, we will provide a rent subsidy that is here and is going to stay.

The Senate has acted to restore cuts in the rent supplement made by the House. I have advocated the rent supplement, as you know, and sponsored amendments that limited its original scope. I would like to point out again why I believe in this as a move in favor of private enterprise.

When the original bill was presented 2 years ago, I had an immediate reaction against the idea. I questioned the fact that anybody's rent should be paid by the Government. I listened in hearings and when people devoted to free, private enterprise advocated the program, I began to think that perhaps I had made a snap judgment.

My study has convinced me that the principles involved do foster free enterprise and will save our Government millions of dollars in construction. It is also the first time since the passage of the initial act on public housing that private enterprise has had a chance to compete with public housing.

I would appreciate it if you will listen

to the reasoning processes set out below through which I became convinced that the rent supplement is a sound, private enterprise program. I would also be glad to have your comments on my analysis.

First of all, we already have a rent subsidy. We have had this rent subsidy since the first public housing project was built. This subsidy is in the form of lower rent in Government projects than a tenant would pay in comparable housing owned by private owners.

We know, to be practical, that public housing is here to stay. Therefore, the subsidy in public housing will stay as well.

The question then becomes how to finance this subsidy with less cost to the taxpayer.

The present method of financing this subsidy is to construct housing with public funds, to operate the housing by public agencies, to repose ownership in public agencies and to remove the real estate from all tax digests of cities, counties, and the States. In short, the existing subsidy is financed almost 100 percent at the expense of the taxpayer.

The rent supplement offers the follow-



ing alternative to the present subsidy. People eligible for the existing public housing subsidy will be provided comparable housing of the same standard and quality in private housing. All the Government will pay is a difference in the rent the tenant can afford and the actual rent. Private capital will finance the construction, private enterprise will operate the housing, private enterprise will own the housing and the real estate will remain as taxable property on all city, county, and State tax digests. In short, the proposed subsidy will be financed almost wholly at the expense of private enterprise.

My premise, then, as I said, is that I have a choice but this choice is not whether we will have a rent subsidy. It is whether we will have a rent subsidy financed largely at public expense or largely at private enterprise expense.

Of course, with this choice I select the way of private, free enterprise.

There are elements which have influenced my thinking on the rent supplement. Free enterprise asked for this legislation. It has been endorsed by the National Home Builders Association, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Georgia Association of Real Estate Boards, and the Georgia Realtors.

No project will be approved unless it has the approval of local officials.

It would be a method to accelerate the building of houses that we are not able to do with public funds unless we substantially extend the public housing program. In this connection, if we accelerate the war in Vietnam, it is not only military housing that is going to have to be provided for people, but also private housing for civilians that will have to be built.

There are detailed restrictions, too, in the law. First, as to who may be a beneficiary of the rent supplement; second, restrictions on income of the beneficiary; and third, restrictions on who may be the landlord of the housing units.

The first of these restrictions limits beneficiaries of the rent supplements to people who are eligible for public housing and who are also either elderly, handicapped, living in substandard housing or displaced by Government action or natural disaster.

The final restriction to prevent windfalls for landlords is that the legal entity constructing the housing for rent supplement benefits or acquiring such housing shall be a nonprofit corporation, a cooperative association, or a limited dividend corporation.

In conclusion, I recognize that it is difficult to compare costs of public housing and rent supplements. The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates—and this is in the printed record—that over the long haul the housing of the same number of families by rent supplements will be less costly than the public housing.

But—in terms of immediate impact on Federal spending—and we are all concerned about the present budgetary situation—rent supplements will clearly provide more housing for less current expenditure than will public housing.

In my hometown of Athens, Ga., it

costs a little less than \$16,000 to produce one low-rent public housing unit. At an average annual rent supplement payment of \$900 per year, this same \$16,000 would provide housing for some 18 families.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, is it true that the distinguished minority leader of the other body, the senior Senator from Illinois, in view of the improvements made in this program and the guarantees against abuses, is now supporting this program?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that I have read press statements to the effect that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is supporting both the model cities and the rent supplement programs. I have not talked with the Senator personally, but I have read reports that he is in favor of the rent supplement program.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I point out that one of the most vigorous and strongest opponents of public housing was the National Association of Real Estate Boards. All of us were besieged with their protests when the issue of public housing came up. That association is strongly in favor of this program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. The rent supplement program is being supported and advocated by many responsible organizations. Among them are the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Council on the Aging, many churches, charitable organizations, private enterprise, and many others.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I think some things should be said that have not been brought out in the debate so far. The question here is not whether we will pay rent subsidies or not. There is \$5 million in this bill that is not in dispute for rent subsidies. That is agreed by the House and the Senate. What we are talking about here is whether we will give the administration \$40 million of additional contracting authority, meaning authority to go out and contract to build houses and pay subsidies for 40 years on those houses.

So what is involved here is not \$40 million, but it is \$1,600,000,000, 40 years times \$40 million.

Now, there are some of us who are not willing to commit the Federal Government today to another brand new obligation of \$1,600,000,000, superimposed upon \$275 million this year in subsidy for public housing; and superimposed upon a \$750 million appropriation that is in this bill for urban renewal; and superimposed upon \$30,000,000 for neighborhood facilities, \$25,000,000 for special housing for the handicapped and elderly, \$75,000,000 for open space land, \$165,000,000 for water and sewer facilities,

\$175,000,000 for mass transportation and upon millions upon millions for other programs designed to benefit certain segments of society.

I think we ought to move a little more slowly, particularly since we have a collateral program that is responsible for building more rooms for occupancy by poor people than the rent subsidy program has built. I refer to the rent certificate program, which is usable today, and which is available, and which can be utilized to far better effect and with less expense and less cost to the Government, and which requires, I might add, only 20 percent of the payment of income in rent, whereas the rent supplement program requires 25 percent.

It is a far better program for the poor than the rent supplement program. It is already in effect.

I would add that 95 percent of the houses now being rent supplemented are houses that have been rehabilitated. They are not new construction that has been constructed under this program. They are rehabilitated housing. That is similar to the rent certificate housing that is now available to all.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman from North Carolina tell us how much money is being spent, how much money it costs the Government to supplement rents?

Mr. JONAS. The average is \$900 per year per unit.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman is talking about rent supplements?

Mr. JONAS. I am talking about rent supplements. The average payment they are making is \$75 per month per unit.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. What is the total amount being expended under that program?

Mr. JONAS. I do not remember offhand. There is \$5 million in this bill, not in dispute, to continue payments on programs outstanding.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Forty million dollars under the same budget is for construction of additional units?

Mr. JONAS. For new contract authority to permit them to go out and make contracts that will run for 40 years in the future.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, we have acted with utmost disregard today against programs which hold the promise to help smooth the journey of America through the difficult times ahead.

For fiscal year 1968, President Johnson asked \$12 million in planning funds, \$400 million for actual model cities programs, and an additional \$250 million for urban renewal. Of this amount requested this body approved the full \$12 million for planning, but only a meager \$150 million for actual programs and only \$75 million for urban renewal. Today, we have refused to reconsider our initial judgment, and we have made this determination after a long, hot summer of riots and turmoil, caused in many instances by the very environmental ele-

ments which the model cities programs would work to combat. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Senate will remain firm in its appropriation of the full amounts for both planning and model cities programs. There are currently nine New Jersey cities with model cities program applications pending, including Jersey City.

The second worthy program which we have disposed of today involves rent supplements. The Senate has recommended \$40 million. We have recommended nothing. Mr. Speaker, this is one answer to the urgent cry for more and better housing for poor and elderly families. The cost of decent housing, at today's prices, weighs disproportionately on the income of many poor families. The rent supplements program gives a chance to move up in the society. And I might add that \$40 million is not much money to help an estimated 44,000 families and single individuals.

Mr. Speaker, there are three proposals for rent supplements programs stagnating in the Washington office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development from lack of funds. In Bayonne, N.J., Laborer's Pride Apartments, Inc., has submitted a plan for 130 units costing \$80,000. In Jersey City, St. Michael's Methodist Church is sponsoring a project for 109 units costing \$83,000. In Elizabeth, Humane Renewal is proposing 44 units at a cost of \$33,600. Mr. Speaker, when these people ask why the House cut these programs, what answer should I give?

We have gutted today the heart of programs designed to stop the great cities of the United States from sinking down into a bog of slums, places filled with crime, hate, and intolerance. Admittedly, these programs would not be a panacea for our problems in the cities. But combined with other programs to improve law enforcement and municipal facilities we will have at least made a start.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1965, the 89th Congress passed legislation establishing a rent supplement program. Since that time we have authorized \$32 million for use in the program. All of that funding has been allocated.

This money has been earmarked to help 34,000 families and individuals obtain good, clean, decent housing.

The question now before us is this:

Are we going to allow this to be our complete effort in helping poor Americans to live in dignity, and with hope?

We have the opportunity to continue the funding of the rent supplement program. Thousands of families, living in the slums and tenements of urban America, are looking to us for help.

They are looking to us for a chance to rise out of the degradation of slum living. We cannot fail them.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my fellow Members join me in welcoming the growing bipartisan support for the rent supplement program.

It shows that the fog of misunderstanding and confusion about this much-needed program is dissipating.

This is an encouraging and hopeful

sign to those who are poor and poorly housed in this country.

Rent supplement housing serves low-income families only—those who have incomes at or below the local public housing requirement. There is a provision limiting family assets as well.

These requirements guarantee that the program serves the low-income market as it is intended. There is no limit placed on the ability of a tenant to improve his economic lot in life, however.

Rent supplement tenants pay one-fourth of their income toward the market rent for their home. Any difference between that payment and the full rental is made up by a supplement to the private owner of the housing.

Because he receives this supplement, the owner can make decent housing available to families who do not make enough to compete economically for standard housing in the private market.

We ought to provide the funds necessary to keep it moving.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when funding of the rent supplements program was before the House earlier this year I supported the level of funding of that program recommended by the Appropriations Committee; to wit, \$10 million. I continue to support the concept of the rent supplement program and feel that it should be given reasonable funding this year. However, I cannot support the full measure of funding recommended by the Senate; to wit, \$40 million, during this time of fiscal crisis. I do not feel in our present fiscal situation that we can afford the \$40 million funding level of this program proposed by the Senate, although it may be very desirable. I, therefore, intend to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede, which would have the effect of accepting the Senate funding figure of \$40 million, in order that the matter may be returned to conference and the conferees may have an opportunity to agree upon a reasonable funding level consistent with both the value of the program and our present fiscal situation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1967, the House adopted my amendment to H.R. 9960, to prohibit the expenditure of funds to be appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, Public Law 89-754.

Section 204 established the procedures and requirements for areawide planning within standard metropolitan statistical areas in the United States. The section required that any applications for Federal grants-in-aid for a large category of projects—hospitals, airports, libraries, water supply, and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, and water development and land conservation be subject to the review by these metropolitan area planning agencies and that the views of such planning agencies accompany any application submitted to Federal departments and agencies for grants-in-aid therefor. The implementation of section 204, as originally contemplated by HUD before my amend-

ment, would have permitted Federal agencies to withhold Federal funds from projects under the numerous grant-in-aid programs I have just mentioned in order to push for metro government in standard metropolitan statistical areas through federally dictated regional planning agencies.

At the time the act was considered last year, I voiced concern over the possible effects of section 204. I suggested that many States did not have authority to authorize the establishment and continuation of areawide planning agencies. I suggested further that such an areawide planning requirement tended to usurp the responsibilities and authorities of local, county, and municipal elected officials with respect to areawide planning, unless such officials participated in the creation of and in the subsequent decisionmaking of these areawide planning agencies.

On May 17 I offered my amendment to prohibit HUD, the principal agency involved in the initial administration of section 204, from using any funds appropriated for fiscal year 1968 to administer section 204. The House agreed to my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened with respect to section 204 since May 17?

HUD has assumed no responsibility for administration of section 204 since June 30, 1967; and because of my amendment, HUD does not now have any authority with respect to section 204. As a consequence thereof, since June 30 the Bureau of the Budget has been overseeing the Federal responsibility for section 204.

I have been informed that since June 30, 1967, HUD has proceeded no further with dictating the designation of metropolitan areas or areawide planning agencies to carry out the provisions of section 204. Areawide planning agencies were designated for all but 40 of the metropolitan areas designated by HUD prior to June 30. The Bureau of the Budget advises that all 40 of these areas now have areawide agencies properly designated by the Governors, so that every standard metropolitan statistical area now has an areawide planning agency designated to carry out the provisions of section 204. The Bureau of the Budget further advises that no applications are being received by any Federal agency for programs covered by section 204 unless such applications are accompanied by the views of the areawide planning agencies. The Bureau of the Budget expresses the view that HUD does not have to proceed any further with any additional designations of areas or agencies in that the Governors have done so and that they feel that HUD's responsibilities in this regard are complete.

The acceptance by the House of my amendment has done much to accomplish that which I felt was essential if the State and local government are to maintain effective control of these areawide planning agencies, not letting them become mere instrumentalities of the Federal Government. The slowdown in the designation of areas permitted many States to act responsively to the pro-



gram, without undue pressure from HUD, which might have otherwise been the case. Most of these planning agencies are made up of local elected officials, something which I felt was essential to the proper functioning of areawide planning. The Governors now appear to be satisfied with the implementation of section 204 during the past several months. It is my understanding that many State and local officials feel that the objective, flexible, and responsible administration of section 204, as it has been carried out during the past few months, was a direct outgrowth of the Federal agencies' recognitions of the desires of the House by acceptance of my amendment. No funds have been cut off and basic programs have thus been preserved. In this regard, I think my amendment has served a valuable purpose. What could have become a tightly controlled Federal dictation over local areawide planning is apparently being turned into an objective approach that is responsive to the needs of all levels of government.

My amendment applies only to funds appropriated for administrative expenses within HUD for fiscal year 1968, thus enabling these areawide planning agencies to achieve, during this fiscal year, the stability which will be required for the proper administration of section 204 requirements over the years to come. My amendment will affect only those programs administered by HUD, not programs under other departments. By the end of fiscal year 1968, when my amendment will expire, perhaps HUD will realize that its original envisionment of this section has had to necessarily give way to an objective, responsible approach, which gives full recognition to the responsibilities of elected local officials. This is very important, because it may have the effect of preventing HUD from vacating the decisions and judgment of the local agencies with respect to applications submitted.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9960, as reported by the conference committee, has retained my amendment. I commend the conferees for their farsightedness in this regard. State and local governments will benefit greatly from the strong position taken by the House conferees in support of my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the House and of the conference committee with respect to section 204 points out clearly the need for Congress to take a new look at section 204 of the 1966 act. I think the weaknesses of the section have been highlighted by the turmoil which the section created. I strongly urge the House Committee on Banking and Currency to hold hearings on section 204 and related sections of the 1966 act at the earliest possible date, to consider what revisions if any, are needed to assure continued local or areawide rather than Federal control over planning.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I support full funding of the rent supplement program. Many long and arduous hours have been spent by the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee—a subcommittee which I am proud to chair—to develop programs

which would meet the housing needs of all people.

It was through the work of this committee that the rent supplement program became a reality. We set about the task of aiding low- and moderate-income families so that they too could live with decency and pride.

This was not a task for Government alone. We asked and received the assistance of private enterprise in getting this program moving.

And private industry has responded effectively and enthusiastically. The total allocation of \$32 million for rent supplements was exhausted in the first year of program operation.

This money will be used to help 34,000 families, of which 1,200 are now living in rent supplement units.

But this is not enough. This is only the beginning. Congress has a responsibility to the thousands more who need our help.

Are we going to tell the less fortunate in Newark or Detroit—New York or Los Angeles—Philadelphia or Chicago—or any other American city—that we have done our part—that our job is done? I should think not.

Are we going to tell the private sponsor, the builder, the lending institution that they no longer are needed? I hope not.

We have been called upon to assist our fellow Americans live better lives, bring their children up in decent surroundings, and reside in a decent home which they can afford.

This Congress, as those before us, is responsible for the welfare and well being of all America's citizens. Are we going to shirk that responsibility?

The rent supplement program is designed to help the poor, the handicapped, the elderly—people who need our assistance, people who are living in the slum, the ghetto, the tenement.

The rent supplement program deserves the support of all of us. The people who need and want this program deserve our support. The sponsors, the builders, the lending institutions, which have supported this program because we requested them to, deserve our support.

There are applications for over 15,000 rent supplement units from all over this country which cannot be acted upon until we act. Are we going to let them sit in a file, gathering dust? Or are we going to respond to the needs, the wants, the aspirations of the people we represent?

The time for action is now. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in this House will join me in support of adequate funding for the rent supplement program.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, we passed a new housing program to aid some of the millions of Americans who are forced to live in substandard housing. The rent supplement program was, and still is, one of the most creative and potentially valuable approaches to this problem to come along in many years.

Initially we were gratified with this indication of a new Federal approach. At last, we had a program which would help individual families obtain much needed

improvements in their housing at rates they could afford to pay and without the stigma which often accompanies residence in public housing projects. It is now possible for a family to obtain a good home and receive a subsidy which would permit them to pay a higher rent for better housing. Then as the family's income increased, it would pay a larger share of the rent. If the family's income eventually surpassed the level of eligibility for the rent supplement program, the family could still remain in the housing and thus not be penalized for having achieved a higher standard of living.

It was only a short time after the implementation of the program that we came to know that while the Federal Establishment might have given way to a brainstorm in creating the rent supplement program that it was not going to be guilty of creative financing. The first year of the rent supplement program was miserably underfunded and the second year was unfunded. Earlier this year, the House decided that the new program should not only be crippled, but killed. However, we have been offered a second chance to save the rent supplements by giving it a \$40 million reprieve.

The \$40 million which is being asked for the very young rent supplement program will be money which is well spent. We have not seen the real benefits of the program because we have not given it the opportunity which it so richly deserves.

My only objection to the proposed \$40 million appropriation is that it is woefully inadequate in terms of really meeting the housing crisis in America. I recently introduced a Full Opportunity Act which calls for funding the rent supplement program at the level of \$250 million per year as part of an overall effort to eliminate substandard housing. While I shall continue to advocate and seek a higher level of funding for this very valuable program, I urge this body to pass the \$40 million appropriation today so that the rent supplements can at least aid the few, until we reach the obvious conclusion that we must assist the many who are forced to live in inadequate housing.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is too much to hope that the House will have learned from the events of last summer that its action of May 17 in denying any appropriations for the rent supplement program contributed to the sense of hopelessness and despair which permeates the ghettos of our cities. However, perhaps the House will recognize the importance of this program. The vote on the motion by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will tell.

I certainly urge support for the \$40 million Senate figure. It is a very modest amount and will not make much impact upon our severe housing shortage. It will only provide some 45,000 units of rent supplement housing for the entire Nation; and because of the inequitable 15-percent limitation no single State will be eligible for more than 6,750 units.

Congressional treatment of this program is indicative of an appalling lack of concern for the ill-housed people of America.

The total of congressional authorizations for rent supplements is \$105 million—\$30 million for fiscal year 1966, \$35 million for fiscal year 1967, and \$40 million for fiscal year 1968. Despite the obvious need and the urgings of the administration, only \$12 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1966, and \$20 million for fiscal year 1967.

Now the administration's request of \$40 million for fiscal year 1968 hangs in the balance, having been accepted by the Senate but denied by the House. I regret that the conferees did not agree to the \$40 million Senate figure, but we can do it now.

Mr. Speaker, although the Senate did accept the \$40 million figure, the Senate Appropriations Committee wrote into its report a requirement which would cripple the program. It said that nonprofit sponsors of rent supplement projects should provide 5 percent equity if assistance is sought under the special assistance program of FNMA. The effect of this requirement would make it impossible for labor, educational, religious, fraternal and civic organizations, which lack the necessary capital, to become sponsors. These are the very groups which should be encouraged to sponsor rent supplement housing. I spoke about this problem on September 27 when H.R. 9960 was sent to conference, and I have discussed it with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and other House conferees. I urge the conferees to oppose the imposition of such conditions.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, about 34,000 American families will be aided in obtaining decent housing under the present allocation of rent supplement funds. Some already are receiving this aid. Others must wait on new construction.

The 34,000 families that will be helped when all of these projects are in operation should only reflect the start of a productive era of assistance to our poor.

We can help bring these people out from the breeding place of poverty—the slums. We can help these people attain the dignity that comes with decent, clean surroundings. We can help these people begin new lives.

Thousands of families across this Nation are waiting and hoping that we will act. The elderly, the handicapped, the poor need our help.

Where before these people had nothing to look forward to but the filth and degradation of the slums, they can now see a glimpse of a future.

We must not fail them.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the rent supplement program at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally during the session it is not surprising to hear testimonials made about a relative

of mine by Members on both sides of the aisle. I will say this body does not offend as often in this regard as does the other body, but frequently I have been tempted to reply to such statements. It has always seemed to me that with the period of time that has passed and the complications of our present life that perhaps to speculate upon what a particular man might say or do on a particular issue at a particular time is nothing more than speculation. To borrow something reported to have been said by Abraham Lincoln, "It seems to me if I spend all my time answering one way or the other the way my father has been quoted to me, I would have little time to do anything else."

With respect to this bill, however, I would like to say a couple of things. It seems to me that the question on the conscience of the House is not whether we wish to provide adequate housing for Americans. Indeed, I am sure we do. Rather, it is what is the most effective method of providing that housing? We have public housing, and many of us have supported the rental certificate plan, which is the most effective program lately, from the facts and figures available. We have the various FHA programs in the private enterprise category. We have proposals now made to encourage homeownership, which I hope will reach the floor of this House in this session.

I would like to ask this: Is there anything in the record as to the real difference between the rent supplement programs and the rent certificate programs? The difference is that the rent certificate program will be administered by Washington, by a bureaucracy, by HUD, and they will be the ones setting the standards and administering the program. Are we better off to keep the public housing down, as the rental certificate program does, at the metropolitan level and have those authorities make the decisions?

It is on that basis I have made my decision as to how I would vote on this program, and I have heard nothing that has convinced me I should do otherwise.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last May when this House, by a vote of 232 to 171, refused to approve additional contract money for the rent subsidy program, it did not kill the program. It merely restricted the rent subsidy scheme to the \$32 million a year already authorized for 40 years by the Congress.

We should not agree to increase the appropriation for the purpose of expanding this scheme. Let us not forget for a moment that under the present law every additional contract dollar we add to this program obligates us for 40 years. So that when we speak of an additional appropriation of \$40 million, we are actually speaking of \$1.6 billion because we obligate ourselves to this amount.

To those who argue that this is a great piece of free enterprise, let me remind them that the only reason the real estate, banking, and building industries like and support this rent subsidy scheme is be-

cause for 40 years they will have nothing to worry about. The rentals in these buildings will be guaranteed by a 40-year contract. Why should not the building, banking, and real estate people be for this scheme when it means a guaranteed profit for 40 years?

This tricky scheme—a social planner's dream disguised in housing terminology—was projected not to provide needed, adequate housing per se, but to place the poor in middle-income housing for the purpose of promoting economic integration.

Let us make no mistakes about it. This is a scheme to federalize American residential patterns and subsidize forced economic integration.

I say to you that if you support an expansion of this rent subsidy scheme, you will be supporting a program that will help to undermine and destroy the incentives of Americans to better themselves by their own efforts and hard work—a traditionally American economic philosophy.

Under this tricky scheme, a tenant eligible for public housing can be eligible for rent subsidy in middle-income housing if he agrees to pay one-fourth of his income toward the rent.

Let me give you a classic example. Take a family of four members making \$4,400 a year. They can move into an apartment where the rental is \$2,100—or \$175 per month—if they pay only \$1,100 toward the rent. Who picks up the tab for the difference? Uncle Sam. The Government will pay the \$1,000 a year difference.

In my book, this scheme would subsidize the spongers and the loafers to the discouragement of the middle-income tenants who have to work hard to pay their full rent. Under this tricky scheme of rent subsidies, these hard-working tenants would have to pay their own full rent and also help pay part of their neighbor's rent.

I say to the Members of this House that if they are concerned about decent and adequate housing for the poor, we can provide twice as much housing for the same kind of money through an expanded program of public housing and rent certificates. If we are interested in housing needs and not economic integration, we would be building more public housing. There is no question that the rent subsidy program is extremely wasteful and much more expensive than public housing. It stands to reason that under this program only middle-income housing will be built which requires a higher level of subsidy. Secretary Weaver has even said that only someone with a heart of gold but a head of lead would build low-income housing under this program.

The experience we have had so far clearly indicates that rent supplements would average about \$950 per year per unit which is more than twice the average subsidy paid for public housing units. This is wasteful.

I would like to refresh the memory of the Members of this House by reminding them that the rent certificate program, which we here in the House designed, has worked well and is doing the job of providing genuine low-income



housing for the poor. Right now, it is helping six times as many poor people as the rent subsidy program at a lower cost.

To those of you who are unaware of public opinion on this rent subsidy scheme, let me remind you that from coast to coast, the people—your constituents—are overwhelmingly against this scheme.

I would like to read the results of congressional district surveys taken on the rent subsidy question which I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 15 of this year.

I will read the percentage of people in each district who support the rent subsidy program:

In Lansing, Mich., only 19 percent support rent subsidies.

In Rochester, N.Y., 16 percent.

In suburban San Francisco, 16 percent.

In Berkeley, Calif., 28 percent.

In suburban Chicago, 15 percent.

In southeast Illinois, 10 percent.

In Cleveland, Ohio, 19 percent.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., 8 percent.

In Columbus, Ohio, 5 percent.

In suburban Indianapolis, 5 percent.

In north-central Pennsylvania, 35 percent.

In Mobile, Ala., only 18 percent support rent subsidies.

These polls were taken in 1965 and 1966, before the great riots. I have only been able to find two polls taken in August and September of this year: Springfield, Ill., where 27 percent of the respondents supported rent subsidies, and Scranton, Pa., where 28 percent agreed. There you have it. All over the United States, public opinion has figured this program out. I cannot see why anybody here would vote for it when the American people are so obviously against it and it is such a tricky, wasteful program.

It might also be important to point out that in this period of war, we cannot afford experimental frills and gravy.

With the serious threat of inflation and rising costs and the prospects of higher taxes, I say to you that now is no time to waste the taxpayers' money. Certainly this is not the time to expand a program which has been proven to be a tricky, expensive way of meeting low-income housing needs.

I urge the Members of this House to maintain their position against increasing the appropriation for this rent subsidy scheme.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to try to put the record straight.

The minority leader apparently seems to be somewhat confused as to who will be the beneficiaries of this money in rent supplements.

Of course, this is privately financed, as the gentleman from New York just pointed out.

The gentleman from Michigan wanted to know whether or not one could be eligible for rent supplement housing if he had \$25,000 in the bank? The answer is he would not be. He must meet the criterion of the relief recipient. And he must

pay 25 percent of his monthly income as rent.

The gentleman from North Carolina says he would supplement that person for 40 years. That is not true. We would supplement the family, if it were a large family, and that family would grow and its children would have income. As the income increased the rent supplement would go down.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania misunderstood me. I did not say we would supplement the rent of every tenant for 40 years. I said the Government would be obligated to pay the amortization on the cost of the building for 40 years.

We are going to have to keep the building occupied, but these units may be occupied by different families.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman must be careful, because I think he gave the wrong connotation in this, because as the rent increases and the subsidies go down there would be that much less amortization by the FHA.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a no vote on the preferential motion will mean that the rent supplement issue will be returned to conference where we hope to work out a reasonable level of funding. If the House votes down the preferential motion, I feel that we can come back from conference with a reduced level of funding from that recommended by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67 and concur therein.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 250, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—152

Adams	Dellenback	Gude
Addabbo	Dent	Halpern
Albert	Dingell	Hanley
Annunzio	Donohue	Hanna
Ashley	Dow	Hansen, Wash.
Barrett	Dulski	Harvey
Bingham	Eckhardt	Hathaway
Blatnik	Edwards, Calif.	Hawkins
Boland	Ellenberg	Hechler, W. Va.
Bolling	Esch	Helstoski
Brademas	Farbstein	Hicks
Brasco	Fascell	Hollifield
Brooks	Feighan	Holland
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Horton
Burton, Calif.	Ford	Howard
Byrne, Pa.	William D.	Hungate
Carey	Fraser	Irwin
Casey	Friedel	Jacobs
Celler	Fulton, Tenn.	Joelson
Clark	Gallagher	Johnson, Calif.
Cohelan	Gialmo	Karsten
Conyers	Gibbons	Karth
Culver	Gilbert	Kastenmeyer
Daddario	Gonzalez	Kazen
Daniels	Green, Oreg.	Kelly
Dawson	Green, Pa.	King, Calif.
Delaney	Griffiths	Kluczynski

Kupferman  
Kyros  
Landrum  
Leggett  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McFall  
Machen  
Madden  
Mathias, Md.  
Matsunaga  
Meeds  
Miller, Calif.  
Minish  
Mink  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morse, Mass.  
Mosher  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nedzi  
Nix

O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
Olsen  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Ottinger  
Patman  
Patten  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Price, Ill.  
Pucinski  
Rees  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Scheuer

NAYS—250

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Anderson, Ill.  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Arendt  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Ayres  
Baring  
Bates  
Battin  
Belcher  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blester  
Blackburn  
Blanton  
Bolton  
Bow  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Fla.  
Burleson  
Burton, Utah  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cabell  
Cahill  
Carter  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Clausen  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Colmer  
Conable  
Conte  
Corbett  
Cowger  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Denney  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Dole  
Dorn  
Dowdy  
Downing  
Duncan  
Dwyer  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, La.  
Erlenborn  
Eshleman

Evans, Colo.  
Everett  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Findley  
Fino  
Fisher  
Flynt  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fountain  
Frelinghuysen  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fuqua  
Galifanakis  
Gardner  
Garmatz  
Goodell  
Goodling  
Gray  
Gross  
Grover  
Gubser  
Gurney  
Hagan  
Haley  
Bow  
Hall  
Halleck  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Harsha  
Hays  
Heckler, Mass.  
Henderson  
Hosmer  
Hull  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jarman  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kee  
Keith  
King, N.Y.  
Kirwan  
Kornegay  
Kuykendall  
Laird  
Langen  
Latta  
Lennon  
Lipscomb  
Lloyd  
Long, Md.  
Lukens  
McClory  
McClure  
McDade  
McEwen  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marsh  
Martin  
Mathias, Calif.  
May  
Mayne  
Meskill  
Michel

Sisk  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Sullivan  
Tenzler  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waldie  
Whalen  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wolf  
Wright  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki

Miller, Ohio  
Mills  
Minshall  
Mize  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Moore  
Morris, N. Mex.  
Morton  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
O'Konski  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Passman  
Pelly  
Pettis  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poff  
Pollock  
Pool  
Price, Tex.  
Pryor  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rallsback  
Randall  
Reid, Ill.  
Reifel  
Reinecke  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Riegle  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rogers, Fla.  
Roth  
Roudebush  
Roush  
Rumsfeld  
Ruppe  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Schneebell  
Schweiker  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Okla.  
Snyder  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.

Thomson, Wis.	Watts	Wilson, Bob
Tuck	Whalley	Winn
Tunney	White	Wyatt
Waggonner	Whitener	Wydler
Walker	Whitten	Wyllie
Wampler	Widnall	Wyman
Watkins	Wiggins	Zion
Watson	Williams, Pa.	Zwach

## NOT VOTING—30

Aspinall	Herlong	Purcell
Bell	Jones, Mo.	Rarick
Boggs	Kleppe	Resnick
Broomfield	Kyl	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Long, La.	St. Onge
Button	McCarthy	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	McCulloch	Utt
Diggs	Macdonald,	Williams, Miss.
Gathings	Mass.	Willis
Gettys	Philbin	
Hébert	Poage	

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Gettys against.  
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Herlong against.  
Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Rarick against.  
Mr. Button for, with Mr. Gathings against.  
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Utt against.  
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Kleppe against.  
Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. GOODELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not qualify on this vote. If I had been present when my name was called I would have voted "nay."

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12474, APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,

and for other purposes, insist upon the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 1, and insist on the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GAIMO, MARSH, PRYOR, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, WYMAN, TALCOTT, and BOW.

## PERMISSION UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO FILE A REPORT ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Friday next to file a report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## PROUD ZAMBIA'S THIRD BIRTHDAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Zambia marks its third year of independence. In this short time, Zambia has made remarkable progress in self-development, thanks to the dedication of its leaders, the industry of its people, and the continuing successful exploitation of its rich mineral resources.

Zambia has been able to maintain a position as the fourth largest exporter of copper and already has succeeded in diversifying its routes to the sea to the extent that it is no longer so heavily dependent upon Southern Rhodesia.

In agriculture and education, the Government is spreading profits from copper to the entire population. Local industry is being established to diversify the economy. Zambia is encouraging American business to share in this growing economy. In my remarks of yesterday, which appear on page 29616 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 23, 1967, I was happy and privileged to note the marvelous economic strides Zambia has made and Zambia's attraction to private foreign capital.

At the same time that he is providing his country inspired leadership with his philosophy of "humanism" which emphasizes the common man, President Kenneth Kaunda is proving himself an outstanding statesman in African affairs. He has offered assistance to the Republic of the Congo in ridding itself of mercenaries, he is helping to mediate the long and difficult Kenya-Somalia dispute, and

he has been attempting to stop the bloodshed in the Nigerian civil war.

To the people of Zambia, to their great leader, and to His Excellency Rupiah B. Banda, Zambia's Ambassador to the United States, I extend my heartiest congratulations as Zambia completes its third year of independence.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13606, with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I say in the beginning, there are no non-budgeted items in this bill. Then let me say that the fiscal 1968 budget estimate for military construction was \$2,937 million. The bill before the House carries \$2,142 million. This is a reduction of \$794 million, or 30 percent. The bill is \$362 million below the authorization, or a reduction of 15 percent below the authorization. Very probably these are the most drastic cuts made on any bill brought to the House this year. In all frankness, we may have cut too deeply. I recognize the fact that there is a need for improved facilities for military personnel throughout the Military Establishment in all categories of construction. Many structures now in use are of World War II construction, or older. Some were built to last for a very short period of time, nominally 5 years. Many of them have gone just about as far as they can, further than they should. In many instances the maintenance costs are excessive and the buildings are very unsatisfactory.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be kept in mind that the budget



processes relating to military construction are usually very severe. Actually, military construction gets what is left, after pay and allowances, subsistence, procurement of weapons, research, and other essential matters in the military budget are taken care of. Then, Mr. Chairman, the needs for new military construction are considered. The amount available usually is not very much.

I can say truthfully that just about every line item which survives the budget processes downtown and which is sent to Congress is needed.

Mr. Chairman, we do not put men in uniform to be the goats of the economy drive. We recognize that there are requirements for adequate facilities in the field of military construction. This is an essential part of the defense program. However, we are confronted with an unusually difficult fiscal picture and with a very strongly economy-minded Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to certain specific cuts. Take the matter of family housing.

As contained in the budget, there was a request for 12,500 units of family housing. The committee has funded 8,500 units. This represents a cut of just about one-third below the budget request. That is a very heavy cut.

Family housing is considered to be one of the most important of all considerations for the retention of service personnel. Further, there is at this time a need for approximately 40,000 family housing units at the various military installations. To cut more deeply in this important area would serve notice to military personnel, many of them now engaged in combat in Southeast Asia, that we really do not care whether they have adequate housing for themselves and the members of their families.

Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that there is a backlog of something over 5,000 houses which have been funded in prior year programs but not constructed. Consequently, there is a question whether the Government can or intends to build all of the housing which has been requested.

There were two principal reasons for the backlog of housing. One reason is the freeze on construction that took place about a year and a half ago and which delayed virtually all military construction for substantially a year. Then, there is the problem of increased costs of construction which made it virtually impossible to build adequate housing for military families at the authorized limitation of \$17,500 per unit.

In the military construction authorization, the cost index has now been increased to the sum of \$19,500 per unit. This results in a more realistic figure which will permit reasonably adequate housing. This program is ready to proceed promptly and realistically with the award of contracts for units approved in prior years and those contained in this bill.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there was the matter of a request for \$200 million in emergency funds for use of the Secretary of Defense. The committee has allowed only \$100 million. The emergency fund was requested in large part because of

the requirements in Southeast Asia. We have spent \$2.3 billion for construction in Southeast Asia, and there is carried in this bill \$96 million for additional Southeast Asia construction; all that was requested. Consequently we feel that the real pressure for emergency funds is over. Obviously in a changing and fluid military situation there can still be requirements for emergency construction, but we consider that \$100 million should be adequate, and we have reduced the funds in the bill accordingly.

There are in unexpended funds over \$1 billion within the military construction program. This is a serious matter which requires committee consideration. The situation results from a number of things. The freeze order which I mentioned, and which applied very generally to construction, was a factor. Rising construction costs have made it difficult to contract within the appropriated limits. However, there is the possibility that some projects yet to be built will be cancelled. If in a changing military picture it should be found that they are not needed, they should not be built. There has been a new temporary freeze, and I am glad that we are assured that it is a temporary one.

But these factors combined may make it impossible or unnecessary to spend all of the unexpended funds. So we cut \$100 million out of this bill to be applied against the general availability of funds for construction. I hope this will not work hardships and that it will prove to be a sound action.

Another item is the Defense Intelligence Agency building, a \$20 million structure—and a somewhat controversial structure.

This is a very important agency. It is the intelligence gathering branch of the services. Undoubtedly there is a need for the new facility. We may be doing DIA a disservice because of the importance of their work by denying this \$20 million building, but they are housed, and they are doing their work, and the committee is taking the chance that we can postpone this item another year.

Generally, Mr. Chairman, we have deleted administrative facilities. We have deleted facilities where planning is not far enough advanced to insure that the construction contract can be let, and the construction begun during the current fiscal year. After all, this fiscal year is one-third over. It is late October. And we have deleted those buildings where the troops do have facilities that it appears they can make do with for the time being, not as well as they should and not as well as we would like, but in view of all the circumstances, buildings where they can make do for the time being.

One real problem is the new freeze order, and what this may mean for the future. And we have been assured that it is temporary, that it is intended to be a 30-day freeze, and that only a limited number of projects are under scrutiny. But before the committee brought this bill to the House we asked specifically what plans Secretary McNamara has for the fiscal 1968 funds, and here is what he said—and I believe this is something all the Members will have an interest in.

The letter is addressed to me under date of October 16, 1967. It is from the Secretary of Defense, and I will quote only the essential parts. The remainder of the letter is in the committee files and is available for Members of Congress who wish further information on the matter:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of October 6 requesting that I provide your Committee with details concerning my decision of October 5 with respect to construction contract awards for military construction and family housing. As you are aware, this action was taken as a temporary measure since the Congressional judgment on the federal budget is not clear and the various Congressional viewpoints on the budget have not been reconciled. I thus instructed the various Department of Defense components to review their construction programs and determine what projects could be temporarily delayed until November 9, 1967. That is to say, I instructed them not to request new bids and not to open bids received subsequent to October 9 until at least November 9, except for construction projects required for new weapons systems or in direct support of Southeast Asia. I hope this temporary delay can be terminated before November 9.

It should be noted—

And this is the key part—

It should be noted that this delay affects primarily the 67 and prior-year programs, with a very limited effect to planning and minor construction in the 68 programs. Furthermore, it is not my intention to indefinitely postpone bid openings or invitations to bid; nor does this action have any relation to our intention to proceed with all projects in the FY 68 military construction program in the normal manner.

Now in all fairness to Secretary McNamara, let me spell out the fact that this letter was prepared at a time when the fiscal picture was not at all clear; when Congress has not determined the extent of the budget cuts which may be made; and when readjustments in the defense spending program may be required. But he has expressed quite clearly the intent of the Department to proceed in an orderly manner to carry out the fiscal year 1968 Military Construction program.

Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that the Members of the House carefully study the report which is before you. It is quite complete. It deals with a number of programs that are new to the Congress and on which I believe the Members of Congress will want information.

For instance, there is the beginning of construction for the anti-ballistic-missile program. For this purpose we have \$64,000,000 in this bill. The presently programed thin line—to cost \$5 billion—will require construction in the amount of \$1.2 billion. This thin line is almost certain to be expanded. We are, of course, far behind the Russian ABM program and the one programed probably will not even be adequate to meet the Chinese threat at the time that the Chinese nuclear threat becomes a serious one. So it is almost certain that this program is going to have to be expanded. There has to be a beginning and this is the beginning of an ABM program that many of us have argued for during the past 2 years.

It is a new program. It has some re-

semblance to the missile launching site program of a decade ago, where much had to be learned and costly mistakes were made. Fortunately, much of the experience gained in that program can be utilized in this one.

The report is quite detailed and I think the Members will know much more about the ABM construction program and what is required, if our report is studied.

Now, I would like to discuss the NATO infrastructure very briefly. This item is included for the first time in this bill. Previously it was carried in the foreign aid appropriation. The request before us was for \$60,000,000. The committee felt that \$50,000,000 would be adequate.

This program permits the joint construction of military facilities with the NATO allies. Whatever is needed in the NATO program for the construction of facilities can be built under this program.

I would like to point out that we, on the Committee are more than a little concerned by the fact that heretofore our negotiators have only recovered from our allies about 25 percent of the cost of the NATO infrastructure.

In other words, dear old Uncle Sam with all his generosity has been paying about 75 percent of the bill for the military facilities needed for the NATO program. That seems to us to be an unnecessarily high percentage. In this measure we propose that our NATO allies meet us half way on costs, and I strongly insist that our negotiators keep this more realistic figure in mind in their dealings with our allies on cost sharing.

Let me touch on homeowners' assistance. This is possibly a controversial program, but it is a part of the law. We have a responsibility to provide funds to carry it out. It is for the relief of homeowners, both military and civilian, whose property lost value because of base closures. The Department asked for \$27 million for the remainder of the fiscal year. Again, the fiscal year is a third gone. We know this program must start. We support the program, but we feel that \$20 million is as much as can be utilized properly, and that is the amount we recommend.

The committee calls attention again to the need for a long-range construction organizational structure in the Department of Defense. During each war we have had to plan construction programs from scratch. Southeast Asia, with its tremendous construction tasks, was a classical example of inadequate advance planning for a construction program.

Obviously money and time can be saved through advance planning for such programs. These plans are a logical step, just as we have plans for war emergencies in various areas. We stressed this need last year, but it went largely unnoticed.

It is hard to breach the walls of OSD thinking. Sometimes they make it appear that they know almost everything that they are interested in knowing. The committee expects more attention to be given to this particular problem.

Let me discuss very briefly the effect of the Whitten amendment on this bill. As far as I can determine from a study of

the Whitten amendment, it deals with expenditures. It is intended to hold the agencies of the Government to the fiscal year 1967 expenditure level. This bill, according to present indications, will be below the fiscal year 1967 expenditure level. Therefore, the effect of the Whitten amendment upon it would be minimal.

Let me summarize what I am trying to bring to your attention. We have stressed living quarters and training facilities primarily in this bill. I question that there is any one facility which is more important to long-range morale uplift than proper living quarters. I know the necessity for training facilities. I know that support facilities are essential. But the place where a man lives is the one which is really closest to his heart and which has the most influence in determining whether he feels his is a good base or a poor one, and whether he wants to continue to wear the uniform.

In training facilities, service facilities, and others, no less than in living quarters, we provide, there is a tangible testimonial to men who are doing nothing less than protecting our national heritage. They bear witness to our concern for the individual, for officers and enlisted men alike. They testify to the Nation's appreciation of the relationship between proper living conditions and excellence in performance of duty. And never had the performance of the individual serviceman been as important as it is today.

In this technological age in which we live there is always the danger of losing sight of the importance of the individual to military readiness and strength. This is an age of computers and numbers, of weapon systems and missiles. But the fact remains, if you omit the individual serviceman from any defense equation of computers and stockpiles of weapons, you actually have no equation and you have no defense posture.

Hanson Baldwin wrote in 1962:

We are apt now in this mechanistic age to forget the simple truths of military history. That Man and not machines dominate the battlefields of the world.

Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Navy wrote in 1964:

There is another alarming peril found in a modern fallacy that computers, or economics, or numbers of weapons win wars. Alone, they do not. . . . Our nation will defy every lesson of history if we think that stockpiles of weapons or the decision of computers win wars. Man, his wits, and his will are still the key to war and peace, victory and defeat.

That is why it is important not to forget training and living and supply facilities for men in uniform in our planning for defense.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has looked long and critically at the fiscal year 1968 military construction programs. In cooperation with the authorizing committees, these programs have been substantially reduced. There are projects which have been deleted which many of us would like to have seen funded. I am firmly convinced that to further reduce this program, would be to break faith with the men in uniform who are now fighting in Vietnam and

with their families and loved ones who are supporting them. It would be false economy of the highest sort.

Military construction is one of the necessary tools of war and one of the necessary means to a sound and effective defense. We have tried to provide that which is essential.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I gladly yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which has contributed so much to good legislation for the members of our armed services.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the chairman. I, of course, cannot find any fault with the overall decision of the committee. The only place where I have any question is in relation to the living quarters. I ask the gentleman this question: Should the DOD show good faith in proceeding with the authorized and the appropriated strength, that is, 8,500 units, would the gentleman feel that next year we should continue to accelerate our interest in the backlog and the continuing deficit in this area, which touches the very fountainhead of morale?

Mr. SIKES. I certainly do feel that way. I feel that we have cut to the very minimum when we reduce the requested level of housing units from 12,500 to 8,500. I hope that there will be no further attempt to reduce it. I feel that the entire field of living quarters is a problem which the Congress must face up to, and I hope that we will extend our interest in providing adequate living quarters to assure that there are proper barracks and bachelor officers' quarters throughout the military defense program.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the chairman, and I hope the chairman will insist, when he goes to a conference with the other body, on the House position because we authorized, I understand, about 10,600. You brought the number to 8,500. Even this is a calculated risk. I hope the gentleman will insist on the 8,500 figure in the conference, because to go below that would result in more than a calculated risk in the long-term reduction of the bill, and we can ill afford to lose those units.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have read with a great deal of appreciation in some respects and concern in others, the report. Beginning on page 5 of the report the committee launches into a devastating attack on Secretary of Defense McNamara, doing about everything but actually calling him the "congenital prevaricator." This, I would generally applaud.

Mr. SIKES. I do not believe that that is in the report.

Mr. GROSS. No, it is not. I believe I said that the committee did everything but this. The report cites instances in the past when the Secretary has said one thing and then has done the opposite.



Yet the committee goes on in the rest of its report to give Secretary McNamara money—and plenty of it—about \$500 million above last year's appropriations for the same purposes—saying it expects, hopes, and trusts he will do what the committee wants him to do. The gentleman has read the letter from the Secretary, and the committee has the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that it is his intention "to proceed with all projects in the fiscal year 1968 military construction program in the normal manner."

My question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is: What is the normal manner with respect to dealing with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who has failed to carry out his assurances to the committee in the past? What reason have we to expect him to do so in the future?

Mr. SIKES. I know there is a very definite need for everything in this bill. I feel that we have the assurance of the Secretary that he intends to proceed as best he can to provide these facilities, and I see no choice but to accept his word. We know these facilities are needed, and I do not think we could, in good conscience, refuse to provide them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to take very little time today, because the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has covered this legislation quite thoroughly. It is very complicated in that it contains so many line items that are involved in military installations all over the world. I believe it would be next to impossible for the Committee of the Whole House to be apprised of all the detail that is in this bill. If anyone has any particular questions to raise, he can raise them.

I just want to comment on the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Florida. I think a reading of the discussion in this report which starts on page 5, under the title of "Fluctuations in the Implementation of the Military Construction Program," will pretty well document that there is a credibility gap in the Pentagon. My personal conviction—Secretary McNamara's letter notwithstanding—is that they will not put under contract all of the funds that are carried in this appropriation. I would be extremely surprised if that were done, because we have the past record to go on, and we have the fact that we are already a long way into this fiscal year.

Further in commenting on this legislation, I think, as has been brought out, there is approximately \$540 million more in this bill than was appropriated last year. The expenditure rate for fiscal year 1967 was in the area of about \$2 billion, and, really, this year we are appropriating in the area of \$2.1 billion.

The Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina, reduced the authorization bill substantially, and then, of course, we reduced the fund requested in addition to that. That brings

us back to roughly an appropriation of \$2.1 billion. But I want to agree with my chairman when he says that almost all of the items here requested are items that well can be justified as needed at our military installations.

I do not doubt at all that we could probably have reduced this bill further, and that we could make do with some of the facilities that we have, even longer than we have already. But we are getting to the point, and I think we have to recognize it, where many of the installations which are being used are 25 years old or older. Many of them are temporary structures from World War II. The cost of maintenance is becoming a rather substantial problem. Many of these are due to be replaced.

I believe it is fair to say that the various services have done a very good job in maintaining and using these facilities which were built back in World War II. They have made them do and have found ways to try to use them, but most of them have given just about all the service possible.

I believe we must recognize that the cost of military construction goes up every time we have a new weapons system. Every new weapons system requires additional construction to take care of changes in the configuration of aircraft or other things. Modifications have to be made. This shows up in our bill.

As far as housing is concerned, I am not convinced, looking at the contract rate for the first quarter of this fiscal year, that we will have anywhere near the 8,500 housing units approved under contract in fiscal year 1968. We still have approximately 5,000 units that are still available from prior-year programs. If these 8,500 are put in, that would amount to roughly 13,500 housing units which would have to be awarded in fiscal year 1968. I am just not convinced that is going to happen.

I believe it is perfectly realistic to say that if they are able to place 6,000 to 7,000 units under contract in fiscal year 1968, that will be about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Reading from page 41 of the committee report, the committee states:

For the past several years the committee has discussed with the Department the question of the responsibility of occupants of family housing for damage to such housing during their term of occupancy.

The report goes on to say in general that during these years several similar studies have been made.

Then we get down to the statement from Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius:

Quite frankly, I am disappointed that we have not made any significant progress on this matter. It has been studied too long. I will take steps to bring this to a conclusion as soon as is reasonably possible and to take the action required to implement the necessary improvements.

The fact remains that he now goes "up"—I presume, to his reward as Sec-

retary of the Navy. Having accomplished nothing in this Department, he is rewarded by a full secretaryship in the Navy.

It is about time we got some people in the Department of Defense who saw to it that these studies had some meaning.

The money we are called upon to expend in this bill is more than \$2 billion. It is almost an \$539 million increase over last year.

What kind of dupes are we of the Congress to permit this kind of situation to go on?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Realistically, I believe we must recognize we have thousands of military housing units spread all over the world. It is a little difficult at times to maintain them. We know that they should be maintained better. That is why we bring this to their attention.

In addition to that fact, some of these units are getting a little difficult to maintain. This is why we have a problem.

I believe the base commanders must share a great deal of this responsibility. Actually, I could take the gentleman to some installations and show him where maintenance is rigidly enforced, and the base commander is the man who is responsible for that.

Of course, the buck stops at the top. We are just calling it to their attention. We are not unmindful of their problem, nor are they unmindful of this particular problem. I hope that the colloquy here today will jack them up a little further.

Mr. GROSS. I am not being critical of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I know.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying is, it is about time we got some performance out of these people over at the Pentagon. We are building a new building to house a little Pentagon on this side of the Potomac River, to house the increased employment there and in the Defense Establishment. It is time we got something from this.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I should like to say, with respect to the matter just raised, there has been a great shortage of maintenance money. Families have been forced into many of these units which have not been adequately prepared for them.

As a consequence, when they move in there you cannot expect them to pay the same penalty as they would have to pay if they moved into one that was just refurbished.

I take this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. I note all of the unbudgeted items have been stricken from the report. I do not take issue with it as a general matter, but I note that of the items which were unbudgeted and were eliminated from the bill some would have paid for themselves in 2 or 3 years. It seems to me it would be prudent and good business to have these items incorporated in the bill because we not only promote efficiency but save money in so doing. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee will address himself to that specific question.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I assume my distinguished friend is referring to the naval shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H., in particular.

Mr. BATES. That is one that I have in mind.

Mr. SIKES. I know of the interest of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in that particular naval shipyard and also of the interest of the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] in this important facility. If I may address myself specifically to that facility, I recognize the need for an upgrading of some of the facilities that are at the Navy yard. The committee had no budget request for these items. As I stated earlier, there are no unbudgeted items in this bill. I know that there is justification for the projects under discussion. It would be my hope that there could be a budget request within a reasonable time which would permit us, under the ground rules we are following, to give further consideration to this.

Mr. BATES. I think the ground rules that the gentleman is following apply. I do hope that the subcommittee will see to it that they do have an analysis made of this particular situation and that a substantiation of the facts will be sent to the Congress immediately so that it can be incorporated in this year's bill by the Senate.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield further while I interrupt my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the committee is studying this very matter and has asked for clarification of it by the Department of the Navy.

Mr. BATES. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I have three questions for simple information. One is, I was very intrigued by the statement that the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, made about the number of housing units we are actually appropriating for outside of the 8,500 that might be completed. Did I understand the gentleman to say there are some 5,000 previously authorized and appropriated for in the pipeline?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Around 5,000.

Mr. HALL. So that we might have a total of 13,500 if they use all in this year's appropriation and those from prior years, that are so badly needed at this time of strained morale for the dependents back home?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is correct. The latest information is that there are approximately 5,000 units funded in prior years for which contracts have not yet been awarded.

Mr. HALL. In the homeowners assistance fund brought on through the au-

thorizing and appropriating process by the Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, are there any recommendations, as I have not read the report and the bill itself, as to the \$20 million the chairman of the subcommittee referred to? Have there been any recommendations or is there any legislative record made in the hearings or any history as to the allocation of that? You may remember originally the authorization was only for the military displaced under this act. That was taken out in the other body, and finally approved here. Can the gentleman inform us concerning that? Will this cover all foreseeable needs for military and civilians who might be displaced by McNamara's base closures?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think this will cover everything in the foreseeable future in fiscal year 1968. This program has a great potential for growth.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. It does cover military and civilians. There is no allocation between them. This is the beginning and there will be a requirement for considerably more money than that carried in this bill. We have a long way to go.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Surely; we have been trying to hold this amount down. We requested—and it is my recollection that the defense services agreed—to go slow on this question because the types of matters involved have resulted in increased costs. We must have the guidelines, regulations, and procedures properly worked out or costs will soar.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan that while this represents a worthwhile endeavor, I believe we, perhaps, are opening up a Pandora's box for the future. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my final objection pertains to page 22 of the report. In the bill we have the sum of \$8 million for the southern command. It is my understanding that this is for an electric powerplant at Fort Clayton, which is referred to on page 22 of the report.

I am familiar with and am cognizant of the situation which exists at Fort Clayton. I have visited there. Certainly, I am one who wants to keep our military strength in the Canal Zone up to full par. But did the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, take into consideration the fact that we are liable to have to build a powerplant there and that the three treaties that are still pending before the Panamanian Government, and which as I understand it, are not yet pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but are lying on the desk of the Commander in Chief, might result in us going in and constructing an electric powerplant which we might have to desert?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri recognizes the fact that the proposed treaty to which he has referred is in a state of limbo at the present time. We thought we could not defer this needed project much longer. Actually, as I understand the treaty—and I might say that I have serious reservations about the treaty and that I am not in favor of it—we retain

these responsibilities in any event. I am only generally familiar with the terms of the treaty. However, that is the manner in which I interpret the terms of it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, the only treaty which I have read comes from a Panamanian paper which was bought for a dollar which, allegedly, carries all three pages of the treaty, printed in complete detail. It has not been made available to our own Government for anyone to comment upon, and especially has not been subjected to the scrutiny of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am personally concerned, I hope—and it is only a forlorn hope—that our military perhaps will still stay there after we get out our other civilian elements. I do not think that this matter should be kept too long in a state of limbo.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I share the sentiments which have been expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, in the military construction authorization bill there was a provision for construction of certain rest and recreational facilities at Fort De Russy, Hawaii.

I note the complete absence of any appropriation for this project in the appropriation bill, H.R. 13606, now before us.

Can the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] state the reason or reasons for the noninclusion of any funds for the construction of the authorized facilities at Fort De Russy?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] that I regret the fact I have never had the opportunity to visit the great State of Hawaii and to enjoy the pleasant climate of Honolulu. I would especially hope that one of these days I might be able to do so.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to advise him that had he visited Fort De Russy, he would have been shocked by its termite-ridden facilities that are badly in need of replacement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me that all of us are concerned about the rest and recreation facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have opened up an entirely new field. I am sure that it must be distressing to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] and to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], that my good friend from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has not been to their great State of Hawaii. I think that this omission would be one of the first



orders of business on the schedule of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that it shall be.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. When the gentleman undertakes this trip, we shall endeavor to meet the gentleman with flower leis and hula maidens, not to influence him in any way, to be sure, but just to be in keeping with the custom of our Aloha State.

Mr. SIKES. Now, if I may go ahead with the question of the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii. May I say the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii had previously mentioned this to me. I know of the great interest of both the Members from Hawaii in Fort De Russy. First of all, this is not a budgeted item. I do not know how the money would be used if it were appropriated. The planning is not very far advanced. I have a letter here which appears on page 736 of part 4 of the hearings, from which I quote—and I am advised that there is an inaccuracy in the Record itself, but the original letter in the files of the committee says this:

Development of Fort De Russy for rest and recreation purposes has been under discussion for some time and we have directed the Department of the Army to submit for consideration in the fiscal year 1969 estimates a comprehensive program which will provide for high density development of this property. Accordingly, we are not in a position to use the proposed fiscal year 1968 authorization at this time.

So that it is not a budget item, and the committee would be reluctant to appropriate for a nonbudgeted item for which plans are not complete. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics says in effect, "We are not in a position to use the money."

May I assure the distinguished gentlewoman and the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii that the committee does recognize the seriousness of the need for the rest and recreation program. We know the need for additional recreational facilities in Hawaii for servicemen and their families. We applaud the fact that more and more men are using Hawaii for rest and recreation rather than going to other areas where a gold flow problem would be involved. We are not unsympathetic with this problem, but this just is not the time to appropriate the money for this item.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for providing this information. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will recall that I conferred with him some time ago in connection with this matter, about 10 days ago, and that that information was then provided me. It was my understanding then that the necessary appropriations for construction funds will be made as soon as the Army is in the position to use it, and that in the meantime funds for planning purposes will be available from a general fund.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct, and I am glad to confirm that.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to add on this legislation. It is adequate, I believe, to take care of the needs that are required for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment that funds included in the 1968 military construction authorization bill for the development of new facilities at Fort De Russy in Honolulu were not included in this appropriations bill we are considering today. Men serving in Vietnam are choosing to spend their rest and recreation leaves in Hawaii in ever-increasing numbers.

The Fort De Russy Recreation Center was opened on June 8, 1942, and was the first off-base rest and recreation center in Hawaii for servicemen and their families. It was redesignated the Armed Forces Recreation Center in June of 1949 and was declared a permanent military installation on March 22, 1956. Today De Russy has two primary functions—it is the center of Army Reserve training activities for Oahu and continues to serve as a recreation center, particularly for the rest and recreation leaves for Vietnam-based servicemen. Since the Secretary of the Army designated Hawaii as a rest and recreation area in August 1966, approximately 50,000 men have found respite from their war-zone duties on our hospitable shores, and the number is on the increase. It is estimated that 75,000 military personnel will be on rest and recreation in Hawaii in 1967, with some 70 percent of them being joined by wives and children when they arrive. Pan American Airways is running about 40 flights a month on contract with the Government to bring 160 men each time on daily flights from either Saigon, Da-Nang, or Cam Ranh Bay.

We in Hawaii have taken these servicemen to our hearts. Local people assist in every way to make these men feel welcome as they truly deserve, and the reaction in letters I have received and in letters to the editor in Honolulu has been that the program is a fantastic success. Hotels and gift shops universally offer all services and goods at discount rates. Yet with all the good will in the world, there must be additional action taken to insure the continued utility of Fort De Russy as a haven and center for men resting from the war.

Fort De Russy itself has only 680 beds in temporary quarters at present, and the Army estimates that it could make immediate use of 2,000 rooms with the present demand. Hawaii is famous as a resort, and its many outstanding hotels fully deserve their international reputation, but the attractions of my State are bringing visitors at a pace almost faster than we can accommodate them.

In 1966 we had over 700,000 visitors pass through Hawaii for varying lengths of stay, and this year the projected visitation is a stunning 925,000. This tremendous influx of visitors, which includes rest-and-recreation servicemen and their families in its totals, has strained the day-to-day capacity of our hotels, and I therefore feel that we should go ahead with the \$7 million authorized for the development of these 416 new billets at Fort De Russy. This hotel-type facility will be built well back from the beach so as not to block any of the splendid shoreline view, and full consideration I am certain will be given to preserving the natural beauty of the area. Since the planning of this facility will take 6 to 7 months, I believe that we should give the go-ahead as soon as possible for the initial phases of the work so that the initial occupancy can be scheduled within a year.

There is no indication that the flow of men on rest-and-recreation leave into Hawaii will diminish as our tourism shoots up also, the chief reason being that it is the only rest and recreation area where servicemen's families may join them without going to excessive travel expense. About 85 percent of these men, including dependents, now stay in local hotels, but as our tourist inflow grows, we may be faced with serious problems not till now encountered in finding satisfactory accommodations for all. The military now has an average of 1,460 rest-and-recreation personnel in the State at any given time.

I would hope that the House will see fit to allow the Army to move ahead with plans for these facilities so necessary to meet the need for reasonably priced accommodations for our men in uniform and their families on rest-and-recreation leave from Vietnam.

On this point I wish to address a question to the chairman of the committee.

Are there funds currently contained in this appropriation bill which will permit the Department to do the necessary planning, so that when they do present the 1969 budget the construction funds will be considered by your committee at that time?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to be able to assure the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii that there is a general fund for planning which can be used for this project. Under the terms of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, which I quoted earlier, planning should proceed on this important facility.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman for his assurance.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PETTIS].

Mr. PETTIS. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman a question.

I note that 200 bachelor officer quarters units at the Norton Air Force Base at San Bernardino are cut out of this bill. This is now an embarkation point and it would seem that this is very necessary in spite of the fact that many of these officers are coming and going on almost a daily basis.

I was wondering if the chairman could tell me why these 200 officers quarters were taken out of the bill?

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, I will be very glad to respond.

These units were eliminated by the authorization action. They were, therefore, not before our committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, or any other member of the Committee on Appropriations several questions concerning the inclusion of funds for the conversion from coal to gas for heat and power generation at Elmendorf Air Force Base at Fort Richardson, Anchorage, Alaska.

My first question is, can the gentleman tell me why the Defense Department did not comply with the previous request of the Congress to conduct a study of the proposed conversion with regard to the economic impact on the coal mining industry and on the communities in the Matanuska Valley and the Alaska Railroad?

Mr. SIKES. I am not sure that I know specifically to which study my distinguished friend refers. But I can assure him that this is a matter which has been under virtually continuous study for at least the last 5 years. It has been before the Congress most of that time. I am certain that the facts which have been brought forth about the justification to make the conversion have been researched to the point where there can be no question about their validity.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, in these days of frugal, careful expenditure of funds, why does it seem imperative that the conversion from coal to gas take place at this time? I think it is important that the cost factors involved be discussed at this point and be made a matter of record. More specifically, what will the conversion cost?

Mr. SIKES. I would refer the gentleman to page 366, part 4 of our committee hearings. For the two Alaskan bases now using coal, the conversion will cost \$1,980,000. The savings, Mr. Chairman, are \$2,432,000. Consequently, the conversion will pay for itself in less than 1 year. The amortization period is 10 months.

If the distinguished gentlemen will yield further—and I applaud his interest in this matter; I realize that he and his constituents are very vitally affected—I would like to point to the fact that the Congress has gone into this question with extreme care. We know that there is in Alaska a small coal industry which has been important to the miners and to the owners. We have delayed this conversion for a number of years, hoping that some method could be found whereby we could continue to use coal without too excessive a cost to the taxpayers. But each year, while we delayed this matter, the cost of coal has gone up, and the amortization period has shortened. The savings have become greater and greater year by year.

During the period of careful research and study by Congress, the other major coal users—including an REA organization—have given up coal and converted to gas.

Finally, with all respect to the efforts to preserve a local industry, we in the

committee feel that we can no longer ignore a saving of such magnitude. Consequently, we recommend the conversion this year.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, do you suppose that if the unit cost had not been raised after each annual continuation of the coal contracts, the conversion would still be taking place today?

Mr. SIKES. It is difficult to assess what might have happened or what the amortization might have been. Certainly, if the costs of coal had been kept at a lower level so that the savings were not so great, the committee could have given more consideration than is possible under the present cost data.

Mr. POLLOCK. This may be a difficult comparison, but do you have available the unit cost as between gas and coal?

Mr. SIKES. I am sure those figures are in the record. It is quite voluminous. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will find them and make them available to him.

Mr. POLLOCK. While the gentleman is getting some assistance in finding the answer, I would like to ask another collateral question—

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will turn to page 366, he will find the cost analysis in the record.

If the gentleman wants the unit fuel costs, he will find them spelled out on page 366 of the record. I trust that will be adequate for his purposes.

Mr. POLLOCK. I have one primary concern, and that is if, as you say, the unit cost has been going up year after year in the coal industry after the contract has been extended, do you anticipate this kind of thing in the gas industry? After all, what you will be doing is creating a monopoly for gas. Have you taken any measures during your hearings to prevent this?

Mr. SIKES. There is a 10-year contract for the gas for Fort Richardson and Elmendorf at the cost which is now spelled out. Thus we know there should be no increase in costs for at least for the next 10 years.

Mr. POLLOCK. There is no anticipation, then, that during that period of time the unit costs will be reduced?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. POLLOCK. It will be a fixed amount for the 10-year period.

Mr. SIKES. That is my understanding.

Mr. POLLOCK. There is no doubt in your mind from the facts we have that the amortization for the entire conversion at Fort Richardson and Elmendorf will take place in a 10-month period?

Mr. SIKES. In this business you have to trust somebody.

They brought some very convincing figures to us. We have examined this carefully. They are printed in our hearings for everyone to see and examine and question, and thus far no one has questioned them.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his candid response. I am sure the gentleman appreciates the concern I have that perhaps we are going to be spelling the death knell for the coal mining industry in Alaska, and it is going to be working a hardship on our people.

Mr. SIKES. I know the gentleman's interest in the industry, and I assure the gentleman the Congress has tried to be extremely patient in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that the record does not indicate that the great Committee on Appropriations is committing itself to a course of only appropriating money which has been requested by the Department of Defense. We recognize in this day and time, particularly this year, that conditions are very different and unusual. But if we commit ourselves only to take the course of action of funding projects which come from downtown, the Congress is nothing more or less than an agent of the Department of Defense, and hence we are defaulting in our constitutional responsibility by not authorizing and appropriating for projects which we believe necessary, after receiving testimony before the respective committees.

I hope the chairman of this subcommittee will assure this committee that the fact we are not appropriating money that has not been requested is not to be taken as underwriting and rubber-stamping only those things which emanate from downtown. I hope the gentleman will give me that assurance.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am happy to subscribe to what my distinguished friend has just said. The gentleman from South Carolina has set some very fine examples in not being bound by budget guidelines. I assure the gentleman I have the same feeling about exercising my responsibility as a Congressman to help provide for the Department of Defense those funds which are needed for a sound defense of our country.

Mr. RIVERS. And the gentleman will agree with me that this year is unusual, and he will follow the course of not making a precedent of this year?

Mr. SIKES. The situation this year has caused some unusual actions. We are not merely following the guidelines of the executive branch. Our actions with reference to unbudgeted items is certainly no precedent for the future.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and I thank him not only for yielding to me but also for showing me great personal courtesy in my efforts to properly represent my district. I refer to the Port Chicago item and the \$20 million appropriation that has been approved subject to the requirement that the Navy and the Department of Defense come up with an alternate plan, other than the one they had heretofore submitted which called for condemnation of the community of Port Chicago in my district.

I trust the alternate plan will take, as a takeoff point, the recommendation of both the Senate authorizing committee and the conference committee in terms of the authorization bill, wherein it was stated that the Navy's proposal to solve



the hazardous problem to which my district is subjected, namely, the condemnation of 5,000 acres surrounding their defective ammunition loading piers, and was not in accord with the view of those respective committees.

I trust they will address themselves to the correction of the defect in those piers insofar as they do not comply in any respect, even minimally, with Navy safety standards applicable to piers handling 9 million pounds of high explosives.

I hope also they will take into account the fact that the county of Contra Costa is unnecessarily exposed to an explosion of 24 million pounds of high explosives and will be so exposed unless those piers are corrected.

I conclude by saying that in the event the Navy study does not show that correction of those defective piers is the solution to which they must first address themselves, the study will be very unhappily received by the people I represent and to whom the Navy owes the greatest protection—those who work on the piers and reside near them.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968. The administration budget estimate for this program was \$2,937,000,000. The Armed Services Committee has authorized a total of \$2,333,255,000. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total appropriations of \$2,142,693,000 which is \$794,307,000 below original budget estimates.

Given the present state of our economy and the conflict in Vietnam both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee faced the task of drastically paring down Federal expenditures. I feel that they have acted in a responsible manner under very difficult circumstances. Although I recognize that the state of our economy and the conflict in Vietnam has required a curtailment of Federal spending, I question the Appropriations Committee's deletion of \$4,754,000 for the construction of a 15th Air Force Headquarters facility at the Strategic Air Command's March Air Force Base in California. I hope that the funds will be restored in the very near future since they are needed and were authorized by the Armed Services Committee.

The Appropriations Committee points out in their report that:

The Committee has generally approved the items authorized for the Strategic Air Command which are basically in support of the essential mission of SAC to maintain a force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive world-wide aerial bombardment against enemies of the United States.

It is apparent from this statement that the deletion of the \$4,754,000 for March Air Force Base in California, a major and strategic SAC base, was a difficult decision for the Appropriations Committee and came about only because of our present economic difficulty. It is essential that these funds be restored as soon as our economy permits since it is important that a major command like 15th Air Force have the best equipment and facilities available to carry out

its mission to defend our national security.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has denied the request for \$4.4 million required for the construction of an engineering building at the Mare Island Yard in my congressional district based upon the following assertion:

The request of \$4.481 million for the construction of an Engineering Building at this Shipyard is denied. The San Francisco Shipyard actually consists of the former Hunters Point Yard at San Francisco proper and Mare Island Yard at another location in the Bay Area. These Yards are now classified as divisions of the Naval Shipyards, San Francisco. Activities of the Shipyard are being carried out now as they have in the past in facilities existing at Hunters Point and Mare Island. The Committee fails to see the justification for a consolidation of these activities at the present time and the request has therefore been denied.

The engineering staff at Mare Island is currently located in the Main Administration Building No. 521 as well as in approximately 11 other locations throughout the shipyard complex. The buildings which currently house these engineers and technicians vary in age from 113 years to 25 years and vary in original construction from warehouses to production shops.

It is my understanding that it is the intent at Mare Island to consolidate all the engineers and technicians into one physical location and to provide space for the acquisition of an additional 400 engineers and technicians vitally needed in the support of the submarine construction program currently at Mare Island and which men will be required in the future as the technology in ship construction increases.

It is my further understanding that any consolidation which would be effected as a result of the building of this engineering building such as bringing engineers and technicians from Hunters Point would be limited to such items as allowance preparation, damage control, computerized design research and like items. These numbers would be small. The difficulty of obtaining and retaining qualified personnel in the engineering disciplines is well known. Mare Island has been experiencing all of these problems.

In addition the provisions of proper housing which can be solved by the building of this minimal facility is one which will not only attract engineers but it has been estimated that the simple consolidation of engineers and technicians into one location will increase the total effectiveness of the shipyard by at least 1 percent. This as a minimum will result in the savings of \$1 million per year, amortizing the cost of this structure within 5 years.

I realize the futility of trying to amend back into the pending bill the one \$4.4 million deletion. I would hope that the Senate or a later House-Senate conference would restore this essential item.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge immediate passage by the House of H.R. 13606, the military construction bill for fiscal year 1968. Appropriation of the funds herein provided will help

make possible the provision of modern facilities vitally needed by the military services in these crucial times. More specifically, I have in mind the allocation of a portion of the military construction funds for the modernization and improvement of such installations as the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is one of the oldest shipyards in the country. It is the possessor of a long and distinguished history, dating back to 1776 with the construction of the frigate *Randolph*. It is also one of the finest naval shipyards. Its superiority was attested to by a 1964 Department of Defense report entitled "Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity." On the basis of all factors evaluated, the Philadelphia yard ranked as the single best naval shipyard on the east coast with the most favorable overall industrial potential, the greatest range of capabilities, the best general facilities, and the largest and most efficient layout. The Philadelphia yard also ranked highest in productivity. Furthermore, the report noted that this yard had extensive freshwater berthing which could be rapidly activated in case of war mobilization, and could acquire a nuclear submarine overhaul capability at the least cost compared to other naval shipyards. Unfortunately, however, parts of the Philadelphia yard have been allowed to decay, and some of its facilities are badly run down due to lack of sufficient funds. This is a situation which the Nation can ill afford. Overall improvements and modernization of the facilities of this invaluable yard should not be delayed if it is to remain a powerful element in the Nation's defense. Strengthening of the Philadelphia Naval Yard is made all the more imperative by the fact that two major east coast yards—the Brooklyn Naval Yard and the Portsmouth Naval Yard—have been closed in recent years. The remaining east coast yards therefore carry an increased portion of the workload and responsibility for maintenance of the U.S. fleet in a high state of readiness. It is for these reasons that naval construction funds provided in H.R. 13606 are urgently needed.

We must never forget that our naval shipyards constitute an integral part of our first line of defense. It is axiomatic that fleet base support is basic to naval strength. The Navy must maintain a strong in-house capability that is responsive to the needs of the naval operating forces. This can be achieved only if the physical plants of the shipyards are thoroughly streamlined. This Nation has paid a high price in past wars for its maritime weaknesses. As Members of the Congress, responsible for the security of this Nation, we must not let our maritime capabilities suffer further decline.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about the personal welfare of the officers and men who serve in the U.S. Navy, especially that aspect of their welfare that involves their right to decent up-to-date housing. Thousands of Navy men and their families, associated both with the naval shipyard and the naval station, live in the Philadelphia area. I want to see to it that the Congress make available to them and to our Navy men every-



where the most adequate housing we can possibly provide. Any investment in improved living conditions of our naval personnel and their families will certainly yield a high return in improved morale.

I venture to suggest that, if more tangible public interest were shown for the welfare of our Navy men, the Navy might not have so critical a personnel reenlistment problem. Such positive congressional concern, as would be evidenced by provision of better housing for them, seems all the more essential at the present time when our servicemen are recipients of a great deal of undeserved abuse from various domestic agitators. I believe it is the duty of Congress to see that the men of our Armed Forces receive a decent break from the U.S. Government. We have the ability to do this in substantial measure by our power to appropriate the funds to meet their basic living needs.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I noted with interest the committee's comments on the need for a critical evaluation of serious deficiencies in the military construction program. The typical generosity of the Congress in funding the military budget is an invitation for wastefulness.

The committee has wisely pointed to the desirability of deferring construction of some facilities and the need to make better use of existing buildings at a time of increasing pressure on the budget. It also notes loose management of military construction funds. The accumulation of unobligated balances reduces congressional scrutiny. It is sensible that certain reductions have been recommended.

Where are the budget cutters today? The 1968 appropriations approved by the committee represents an increase of \$539 million or about 34 percent over fiscal year 1967 levels. This is a greater percentage increase than the increase in the military budget as a whole, which includes the great escalation of the war in Vietnam.

I note that the committee recommendation includes \$723 million for military housing; while this is about 10 percent below the administration request, it represents a 50-percent increase over fiscal year 1967 levels. One cannot fail to note the contrast with the HUD appropriation conference report which cuts the administration request by over 25 percent. And the HUD administration request itself was a reduction of \$599 million in available authorization.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when domestic needs are suffering because of a frenzied and irrational compulsion to cut budgets, there is no reason for the military budget to be sacrosanct.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my concern over the excessive expense of the military construction program which is before us today. I will vote against this appropriation.

The military construction and family housing appropriation for this year calls for \$2,142,693,000. This is an increase over last year's appropriation for these items of \$538,623,000. Together with unexpended construction funds from previous years, this appropriation will make available more than \$3,850,000,000 for

military construction and family housing.

At a time when we are faced by urgent problems at home and abroad, when we are facing a large budget deficit, when inflation is a danger, military construction of almost \$4 billion must be viewed with considerable circumspection.

I recognize the advantages military family housing provides to the families of those serving in the Armed Forces, and I have always been a supporter of this program. I also believe that those projects which have been approved by the committee are important and worth while.

However, the real question is whether these items are all more urgent, more vital, and more worth while than all the projects which we will not fund because there is not enough money to go around.

I cannot believe that all of this military construction is, at this time, of higher priority than many of the health, education, employment, and housing programs which are also in need of funds.

From my experience on the Armed Services Committee, I am convinced that much of this military construction can be deferred with only minor inconvenience and most certainly with no strategic loss. Because of the other more urgent demands that are being made upon us at this time, in my view those items which can be deferred without reduction of our strategic capabilities should be deferred.

Thus, I believe that we must further cut back this appropriation and I would hope the conference committee will make the necessary cuts. I will vote for a level of program somewhere near the level of the 1967 expenditures.

I also would like to note my concern over the \$64 million which this bill provides to begin deployment of the Chinese-oriented anti-ballistic-missile system. I view this step with great skepticism. I am presently involved in an intensive independent study of this program. If the facts warrant, I will present a critique of the program. Meanwhile, I accept the judgment of the Secretary of Defense with especial emphasis on his warning against escalation of the program from the so-called "light" defense to the \$40 to \$50 billion "heavy" defense.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13606) making appropriations for military construction for the Depart-

ment of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 26, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—362

Abbott	de la Garza	Hanna
Abernethy	Delaney	Hansen, Idaho
Adair	Dellenback	Hansen, Wash.
Addabbo	Denney	Hardy
Albert	Dent	Harrison
Anderson, Ill.	Derwinski	Harsha
Anderson, Tenn.	Devine	Harvey
Andrews, Ala.	Dickinson	Hathaway
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dingell	Hays
Annunzio	Dole	Heckler, Mass.
Arends	Donohue	Henderson
Ashbrook	Dorn	Hicks
Ashley	Dow	Hollifield
Ayres	Dowdy	Horton
Baring	Dulski	Hosmer
Bates	Duncan	Howard
Battin	Dwyer	Hull
Belcher	Eckhardt	Hungate
Bennett	Edmondson	Hunt
Betts	Edwards, Ala.	Hutchinson
Bevill	Edwards, La.	Ichord
Blester	Erlenborn	Irwin
Blackburn	Esch	Jacobs
Blanton	Eshleman	Jarman
Blatnik	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Everett	Johnson, Pa.
Bow	Evin, Tenn.	Jonas
Brademas	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brasco	Farbstein	Jones, N.C.
Brinkley	Fascell	Karsten
Brock	Feighan	Kazen
Brooks	Findley	Kee
Brotzman	Fino	Keith
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Kelly
Brown, Ohio	Flood	King, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.	Flynt	King, N.Y.
Broyhill, Va.	Foley	Kirwan
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Kluczynski
Burke, Fla.	Ford	Kornegay
Burke, Mass.	William D.	Kuykendall
Burleson	Fountain	Kyros
Burton, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Laird
Burton, Utah	Friedel	Langen
Bush	Fulton, Pa.	Latta
Button	Fulton, Tenn.	Leggett
Byrne, Pa.	Fuqua	Lennon
Byrnes, Wis.	Gallfianakis	Lipscomb
Cabell	Gallagher	Lloyd
Cahill	Gardner	Long, Md.
Carey	Garmatz	Lukens
Carter	Gathings	McClary
Casey	Gialmo	McClure
Cederberg	Gibbons	McCulloch
Chamberlain	Gilbert	McDade
Clancy	Gonzalez	McDonald
Clark	Goodell	Mich.
Cleveland	Goodling	McEwen
Collier	Gray	McFall
Colmer	Green, Oreg.	McMillan
Conable	Green, Pa.	MacGregor
Conte	Grover	Machen
Corbett	Gubser	Mahon
Corman	Gude	Mailliard
Cowser	Gurney	Marsh
Cramer	Hagan	Martin
Cunningham	Haley	Mathias, Calif.
Daddario	Hall	Mathias, Md.
Daniels	Halleck	Matsunaga
Davis, Ga.	Halpern	May
Davis, Wis.	Hamilton	Mayne
	Hammer	Meeds
	schmidt	Meskill
	Hanley	Miller, Calif.



Miller, Ohio  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Mize  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Moore  
Morgan  
Morris, N. Mex.  
Morse, Mass.  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Nix  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
O'Neal, Ga.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Pickle  
Pirnie  
Poff  
Pollock  
Pool  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Pryor  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rallsback  
Randall

Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Reinecke  
Resnick  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riegler  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Ronan  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roudebush  
Roush  
Rumsfeld  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Schneebell  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Shibley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Okla.  
Snyder  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens

Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Tenzer  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tiernan  
Tuck  
Tunney  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Waldie  
Walker  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Watts  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams, Pa.  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Charles H.  
Winn  
Wolff  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wydler  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

## NAYS—26

Adams  
Bingham  
Bolling  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Culver  
Curtis  
Edwards, Calif.  
Fraser

Griffiths  
Hawkins  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Helstoski  
Kastenmeier  
Kupferman  
McCarthy  
Michel  
Myers

Ottinger  
Pike  
Rees  
Robison  
Rosenthal  
Ryan  
Scheuer  
Sullivan

## NOT VOTING—44

Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Barrett  
Bell  
Berry  
Boggs  
Bolton  
Bray  
Broomfield  
Brown, Calif.  
Celler  
Clausen  
Don H.  
Dawson  
Diggs  
Downing

Ellberg  
Gettys  
Gross  
Hébert  
Herlong  
Holland  
Joelson  
Jones, Mo.  
Karth  
Kleppe  
Kyl  
Landrum  
Long, La.  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Madden

Moorhead  
Philbin  
Poage  
Rarick  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
St. Onge  
Schweiker  
Smith, N.Y.  
Utt  
Vander Jagt  
Watson  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gross.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Philbin with Mrs. Bolton.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Kleppe.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Downing with Mr. Kyl.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Schweiker.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Moorhead.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Dawson.  
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Landrum.  
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Holland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

## DICKEY-LINCOLN POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, there has been much disagreement concerning the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the State of Maine. Those of us who oppose the Dickey-Lincoln project are sometimes charged with being tools of the private utility interests. At other times we are charged with distortion of the facts. Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that we oppose the wasteful expenditure of \$380 million of the taxpayers' money.

The Dickey-Lincoln powerplant, on the upper St. John River in northern Maine, would be built solely for power purposes. The only question it raises is whether it represents the most economic way of providing power for New England.

Dickey-Lincoln would provide two kinds of power—100,000 kilowatts of baseload power, and 623,500 kilowatts of peaking power. The baseload power would be delivered for use in southern Maine; the peaking power would be delivered in Boston for use in southern New England.

According to the Federal agencies, if built, Dickey-Lincoln could be completed and "on-the-line" in 1975. Including the \$82.5 million required for the special transmission facilities needed to bring its output down from the remote wilds of the Canadian border to southern Maine and to Boston, Dickey-Lincoln would cost not less than \$380 million when completed in 1975. The figure of \$312 million sometimes used for its cost is the Corps of Engineers' estimate of what it would have cost if built in 1966. The corps' subsequent testimony, and the findings of the House Appropriations Committee's independent investigative experts, show that by 1975 Dickey-Lincoln would have cost \$380 million.

As this is a lot of taxpayer money, and because Dickey-Lincoln would be built solely for power purposes, the question is whether there is a cheaper way of providing the same power. According to the independent experts and the Federal Power Commission, the only water re-

source purpose Dickey-Lincoln would serve other than power; that is, flood control, would account for two-tenths of 1 percent of its total claimed project benefits. This claimed flood control benefit could be provided independently at a total cost of \$1 million.

The findings of the House committee's independent experts, and of the FPC, show that Dickey-Lincoln represents the most costly of all possible methods the Federal Government could pursue or promote for providing power in New England. According to the independent experts and FPC, the total cost of construction an alternative conventional baseload plant in Maine and an alternative pumped storage peaking plant near Boston in 1975, by Government or private industry, including transmission facilities to Dickey-Lincoln markets, is as follows:

[In millions]	
Dickey-Lincoln plants.....	\$380
Alternative plants:	
Baseload (150,000 kw, in Maine, including transmission).....	18.5
Peaking (600,000 kw, near Boston, including transmission).....	71.5
Total .....	90
Excess cost.....	280

If financed by the Federal Government, construction of the alternative baseload plant probably would be by one or more or by a combine of the several rural electric cooperatives in Maine, as done in other States. If financed by the Federal Government, construction of the alternative peaking plant probably would be by the Corps of Engineers, as done in other States, at one of the 16 economic pumped storage sites selected within 100 miles of Boston by FPC.

The findings of the House experts and FPC show that the annual cost of providing equivalent baseload and peaking power in Dickey-Lincoln markets from these alternative plants would be incomparably less than the annual cost of Dickey-Lincoln power—that is, \$10.6 million as opposed to \$16.9 million. Thus:

	[In millions of dollars]		
	Baseload (100,000 kw.) (438,000 kw.-hr.)	Peaking (623,000 kw.) (672,500 kw.-hr.)	Total
Dickey-Lincoln plants.....	16.9	3.2	13.7
Alternative Government plants.....	10.6	2.6	8.0
Excess cost.....	6.3		

If Dickey-Lincoln had been built at the corps' estimate of its 1966 construction cost, the annual cost of its power would have been \$14 million, rather than \$16.9 million.

Actually, due to the fact that the interest charge on REA-financed plants is 2 percent, the annual cost of alternative baseload power would be considerably less than the \$2.6 million figure shown above, as it assumes, along with the House experts and the FPC, an interest rate of 3½ percent.

I believe the foregoing sets forth in a clear manner the costliness and wastefulness of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric powerplant. By classifying as a multipurpose project what is, in fact,

merely a hydroelectric powerplant, the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior are misleading the Congress and the American taxpayer. We must not allow this to happen.

#### POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF HATCH ACT WITH REFERENCE TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN LOUISIANA

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I received very disturbing news from the State of Louisiana; information which I feel obligated to bring to the attention of the House.

I have been advised by an unusually well-informed source that orders have been sent down from Washington to some of the heads of some of the Federal agencies in the State, instructing them to solicit among their civil service employees 300 so-called volunteers to act as so-called poll watchers in the November 4 Democratic primary election. I have been advised that instructions are that if 300 volunteers cannot be found, then 300 men and women are to be directed to volunteer. Rental cars are to be furnished these Federal employees. They are to be paid overtime, since the election is on Saturday and annual leave credited to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is Big Brother in operation. It is not only that, it is a clear and direct violation of the Hatch Act which prohibits civil service employees from engaging in this kind of political activity. It, as well, violates the rights of civil service employees.

How far are we from a dictatorship or totalitarianism if the Federal Government can direct civil service employees to violate the letter and spirit of the law to poll watch or act in any supervisory capacity in any election? There is not a single Federal office at stake in this election. It is entirely local and State contests.

Last evening, when I received this information, I sent a telegram to the Attorney General of the United States, calling this political activity to his attention and asking the pointed question if these employees would be prosecuted by his Department for violating the Hatch Act if they engaged in this activity. I have not yet had a reply, but I await it with a great deal of interest.

This is not a Louisiana problem. This affects every polling place in every congressional district in the Nation. I know of no precedent for this sort of Federal interference and I know of no authority for it.

If this is allowed to happen, then no district is safe from Federal invasion and no election in any State is immune from this same treatment by this or some future administration. The principle is large; the security of free elections is at stake.

I will advise the Congress of the reply I receive from the Attorney General and, if these Federal civil service employees engage in the political activity I have described, a detailed indictment will also be made a part of the Record at the appropriate time.

#### RECORD PROSPERITY HAS ITS PROBLEMS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the mighty economic growth and prosperity of this country in recent years is one of the great achievements of our time. The dimensions of this achievement, which began under our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, and was continued under the leadership of President Johnson, have been excellently documented in an October 10 Wall Street Journal article.

This article outlines our stunning economic success, pointing out that the current business expansion will enter the record books next month as the longest boom in American history. But as with any success, there are always forces at work that threaten to destroy or diminish it.

Such is the case today with our economy. In short, prosperity has its problems. Many eminent economists agree, that unless taxes are raised we run the serious risk of unbalanced and dangerously inflationary growth in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we must be mindful of the problems of prosperity and not shirk our responsibility to solve them. What these problems are and how they came about was recently put into excellent perspective in a speech by Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr. Entitled "In Times of Prosperity, Good Lord Preserve Us," the speech was delivered to the Boston Economic Club on October 4. I commend the speech to the attention of my colleagues, and insert it, along with the Wall Street Journal article, in the RECORD at this point:

#### IN TIMES OF PROSPERITY, GOOD LORD PRESERVE US

(Remarks of Hon. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Boston Economic Club, Boston, Mass., October 4, 1967)

One of the oldest litanies in the Christian Church is one that I believe dates back to around 400 A.D. The priest chants the theme, and the congregation responds with "Good Lord Preserve Us." The priest chants "In times of bereavement. . . ." and the congregation responds, ". . . Good Lord Preserve Us," or "In times of plague. . ." and the response, ". . . Good Lord Preserve Us." One section of the litany has always intrigued me. It goes, "In times of prosperity. . ." "Good Lord Preserve Us."

I am sure that this ancient bit of human wisdom is repeated in most other religions in one form or another. My friends who are better acquainted than I am with theology have explained to me that the chant refers

to the theological belief that men tend to become morally flabby in times when life is easy.

I have often thought, however, that the ancient litany has a different and special significance for Secretaries of the Treasury of the United States. A distinguished resident of this community, Professor Paul Samuelson, has said on occasion that "The job of Secretary of the Treasury can't be an easy one; it's to suffer." I will argue today that their suffering is compounded in times of prosperity, and most particularly in times of excessive prosperity.

Today, a Secretary of the Treasury who fought long and hard for tax reduction as the keystone of long-run national economic policy is pressing the case for a tax increase. And, throughout government, the public purse strings must be pulled tighter. For these are the times when the lessons of the "new" economics merge with those of the "old". Economy takes on its traditional meaning and a measure of fiscal restraint is essential to the national interest.

I now would like to take just a few moments to place my theme and our current dilemma in a historic perspective.

The economic debate in this country over the past quarter-century has in large measure revolved around the question of how to maintain prosperity through the full utilization of our labor, our plant, and our savings. In 1940, when our GNP was running at a rate then estimated at some \$97 billion, I can remember my distinguished professors at Harvard exhorting everyone in sight to use all possible ingenuity to get rates well beyond \$100 billion per year. With unemployment still far too high in 1940, there was ample cause for concern.

It has often been pointed out that the great depression left my generation oriented towards material considerations. I believe that this is probably correct. We were—and perhaps are—rather materialistic in our outlook.

Perhaps it is time someone said a few words in defense of materialism. As is so often the case, I find that someone has already said them. Not Professor Samuelson this time, although they do appear as a preface to a chapter in his textbook, where Francis Hackett is quoted to good effect:

"I believe in materialism. . . . I believe in all the proceeds of a healthy materialism—good cooking, dry houses, dry feet, sewers, drain-pipes, hot water, baths, electric lights, automobiles, good roads, bright streets, long vacations away from the village pump, new ideas, fast horses, swift conversation, theatres, operas, orchestras, bands. . . . I believe in them all, for everybody. The man who dies without knowing these things may be as exquisite as a saint, and as rich as a poet; but it is in spite, not because, of his deprivation."

A materialistic outlook in this better sense possibly accounts in some measure for the emphasis we have seen in this past quarter-century on science and technology, on sophisticated techniques of business management, and on conscious use of national economic policy to promote economic expansion.

Our success in all these areas has been little short of spectacular. As a result, the vast majority of the people in this nation have reached a level of affluence few would have dreamed possible in 1940. The interaction of our success in the areas of science and technology, business management, and our use of national economic policy has changed this country mightily.

On the whole, I believe that the change has been to the good. I believe that the American economy running at full employment is a mighty engine of social progress and reform. I believe that it has brought the opportunity for a useful and productive life to millions of American men and women whose usefulness might well have been lost—as it was, for a time, in the depression



decade. I believe that our success has enabled us to export a measure of hope to a large portion of the world where in much of recorded history hope had been nonexistent.

Having said all this, I must also say that no human situation is perfect, and even prosperity—as the ancient divine so clearly recognized—has its problems. The problems are clearly visible from the United States Treasury. Let me cite just a few of the problems that have developed in the wake of the prosperity that has characterized this last quarter-century.

Twenty-five years ago the problems of pollution, decay in our cities, and the gap between the haves and have-nots in our country were present, but not in the magnitude nor with the urgency that they afflict us today.

The pressures on our systems of transportation and our higher educational complex were simply not present twenty-five years ago.

The intensity of present demands on our capital markets and our savings was not dreamed of during an era in which 3-month Treasury bill rates had remained below 1 percent for 15 years (between 1932 and 1947).

The perils of inflation were usually shrugged off as pure theory or applicable only to situations in which "printing press" money was used.

The danger implicit in a balance of payments deficit was a subject so esoteric that it was rarely alluded to in academic circles.

The real measure of a nation, in my opinion, is its willingness to recognize and acknowledge new problems as they arise. I personally take great pride in the fact that we in this nation do recognize and are fighting for answers in the areas of pollution, urban decay, transportation, education, poverty, financial imbalances, homebuilding, inflation, and the balance of payments. Solving many of these problems will not be easy—perhaps not as easy as resolving the question of how best to promote overall economic growth. But we are attacking these areas; we are responding to the challenge.

These problems—the ones associated with normal, healthy economic growth—have been under attack for several years. They must be attacked head-on, for they cannot be avoided. We cannot and should not accept stagnation as an escape from the difficulties that come with healthy and desirable growth. At the moment, however, the country is preparing to attack a new issue—the question of how to head off the perils of an *unhealthy* and *excessive* rate of expansion resulting from a resurgent demand from the private sector and a continuing heavy demand from the Federal government. These new perils can and must be avoided.

You may well ask at this point, "Why all the fuss?" "What is so different in this current situation?" "Just what are the perils of an unhealthy and excessive rate of expansion?" Let's try to answer the second question first and examine some of the differences between the current situation and those of, say, a few years ago. It seems to me that the main differences are:

1. *The economy is operating in the full employment range.* In contrast to the situation of a few years ago, there is no longer any sizable margin of unutilized resources upon which the economy can draw, and skilled labor is scarce. To be sure, the slowdown in the early part of this year caused the average industrial operating rate to fall back somewhat, but unemployment remains below 4 percent. Relatively full utilization of resources places a fairly definite limit on the rate at which national output can safely expand.

It is estimated that at full employment the overall productive capacity of the economy now grows by about 4 percent annually. Over the next year or so, real output could probably grow at a little more than 4 per-

cent, perhaps  $4\frac{1}{2}$  or even 5 percent, while plant utilization rates are rising. Allowing for a  $2\frac{1}{2}$  percent rise in prices—as measured by the so-called GNP deflator—GNP in current prices might safely rise by 7 percent or so in the next year. As a steady diet, this would be a shade too much since price rises of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 percent annually are too large. But, if the rise of GNP in current prices were held to 7 percent or so in the next year, we would be on a path leading to a less inflationary environment.

We no longer are in a situation where strong rises in demand will yield sizable gains in output and employment. Instead, if the total of public and private spending were allowed to rise at an excessive rate, the consequences would be sharply higher prices. Therefore, with the economy nearing unsafe speed, we cannot keep a heavy foot on the accelerator. We must throttle back to a safer cruising speed.

2. *Price and cost pressures are readily apparent.* The upsurge in demand in late 1965 and early 1966, associated with the early impact of the Vietnam build-up, was checked by monetary and fiscal restraint. But, one unwelcome consequence of that burst of spending was the disruption of a previous pattern of cost-price stability. For example, the wholesale price index rose by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent between mid-1965 and mid-1967 in contrast to a total increase of less than 3 percent during the previous four years. Similarly, the wholesale prices of industrial commodities rose by about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent between mid-1965 and early 1967 in contrast to a total increase of less than 2 percent during the previous  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years. The consumer price index rose by  $5\frac{1}{2}$  percent between mid-1965 and mid-1967, only slightly less than its total rise in the previous 4 years.

In delayed reaction to the burst of demand in 1965 and 1966, cost pressures have intensified. By the middle of 1966, labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing had risen about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  percent over mid-1965, but were still below the level of early 1961. But, by the middle of this year, they had risen a further  $6\frac{1}{2}$  percent. With strong "cost-push" factors already present in the economy, a renewed burst of demand could start wages and prices on an upward spiral.

3. *Interest rates are already at or near last year's levels.* Another crucial difference between the present situation and that of several years ago, is the height of interest rates and the degree of credit availability. Let me say that after last year's "credit crunch," I have no desire whatsoever to see a repeat performance—and I don't think anyone else does either. But, wishing will not make it so. If we are determined to avoid a repetition of last year's difficulties, we must avoid undue reliance on monetary policy to achieve restraint.

Last year the combination of strong credit demands and monetary restraint pushed interest rates to peak levels. By late summer and early fall, not only was credit expensive, its availability was severely limited.

Prompt action was necessary last fall to relieve the overall pressure on financial markets and calm the feverish competition for savings. That action was forthcoming. It included temporary suspension of the investment credit, interest-rate ceilings on consumer-type time deposits, and a temporary slow-down on agency financings and sales of participation certificates. The improvement in financial markets was dramatic. Now, a year later, the situation is substantially different.

Savings flows to thrift institutions have been at record levels this year. Mortgage commitments have been rising strongly. The recovery in residential building has carried the seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing starts back to nearly 1.4 million units in contrast to an August 1966 low of about 850 thousand. Commercial bank credit has risen at a 13 percent annual rate in the first 8

months of this year as the Federal Reserve has pursued a course of relative monetary ease.

In short, credit is much more readily available now than it was a year ago. But, there is a disturbing similarity between the two periods. Interest rates, especially long-term rates, are back at very high levels despite a continuing policy of monetary ease since last fall. Basically, this is because private demands for credit have been extremely heavy this year, partly in reaction to last year's squeeze. Also, the private demands for credit are probably reflecting the faster pace of economic activity since late spring.

Net Federal credit demands have been relatively modest although the picture is changing now. Net Federal demands on the private credit markets can be measured by the change in private holdings of Federal credit instruments, including Federal agency securities and participation certificates along with Treasury issues, by excluding the change in holdings of the Government investment accounts and the Federal Reserve. On this basis, Federal credit demands were only about \$3 billion during calendar 1966 in a total credit flow of some \$70 billion. In the fiscal year ending this past June 30, the net contribution of the Federal sector to total credit demands was actually negative, or near neutrality after allowance for an unusually low Treasury cash balance at the end of the fiscal year. But, in the current fiscal year, even with tax and expenditure action, net Federal demands on the credit markets will rise to the \$10 to \$12 billion range. In the absence of tax action, that figure would soar to the \$20 billion range. This would be beyond the capacity of the markets to handle at anything like the current level of interest rates.

Frankly, even current levels of interest rates are higher than we like to see them. And, without tax and expenditure action, there would be only one way for interest rates to go—up from their present high levels. In contrast to the situation of several years ago, interest rates are already high and the financial system is wound up pretty tightly. Liquidity is at a premium. We have to operate cautiously in such an environment. Therefore, we need—and need very badly in my opinion—an extra degree of fiscal restraint.

4. *Too rapid expansion can hurt our trade balance.* Recent experience also highlights the importance from a balance of payments standpoint of holding the domestic expansion within prudent limits. During the years 1961 through 1964, GNP in current prices rose by an average of about 6 percent per year—more in some years, less in others. During that period, our trade surplus rose by nearly \$2 billion. It was \$4.8 billion in 1960 and \$6.7 billion in 1964, when there were special favorable factors. Not all of the improvement is directly attributable to the relatively moderate rate of domestic expansion. Our exports depend upon the pace of business activity abroad and there are other complicating factors.

In striking contrast, during 1965 and 1966 when GNP in current prices rose at rates between 8 and 9 percent, there was an extremely sharp rise in our imports. Even though exports continued to rise, the trade surplus narrowed to \$4.8 billion in 1965 and to \$3.7 billion in 1966. Indeed, by the last quarter of 1966, the trade surplus had shrunk to a \$2.9 billion annual rate. With a slower rate of expansion this year, the trade surplus recovered to a \$4.0 billion rate in the first quarter and improved further to a \$4.5 billion rate in the second quarter.

An overly rapid rate of domestic expansion can hit our trade balance from both sides. As recent experience clearly shows, the rise in imports is abrupt when the economy presses hard against capacity. Too rapid domestic expansion can also undercut our

ability to export. In the interest of payments equilibrium, we must keep our exports competitive. There can be little doubt that a sustained upward drift in our costs and prices relative to those abroad would soon begin to affect our competitive position adversely.

5. *We are fighting a costly war.* Extra expenditures for Vietnam are running at a rate in excess of \$22 billion per year. While those expenditures do not bear as heavily on the economy as defense expenditures did at the time of Korea, their impact most certainly is felt. Without Vietnam, Federal administrative budget expenditures would amount to only some 14 percent of Gross National Product in fiscal 1968; with Vietnam included, Federal expenditures may rise to 17 percent or a bit more. This would be about the level of 1955 and 1959 and well below the 21 percent reached at the time of Korea. But, it would amount to an appreciable rise over the 14.8 percent ratio in fiscal 1965.

These are the crucial differences in the economic picture at the moment and the picture as it appeared in 1964. Now, what about those perils of an unhealthy and excessive rate of expansion? I would list them as follows:

We are in grave danger of losing control of a relatively stable price structure.

Sharply higher prices throw wage-price relations out of kilter and set the stage for a cost-push inflation.

Cost-push pressures tend to narrow profit margins and encourage efforts to raise prices. Sharply higher prices put the nation at a severe disadvantage in our competitive relationships internationally.

At home, the burden of higher prices falls cruelly on those least able to protect themselves.

And, of course, a strong resurgence of private demand, unchecked by tax and spending actions, can create some very bad days ahead for the Treasury debt managers and for everyone who borrows money.

If our experience since 1960 is any guide, it would seem that we as individuals, as corporations, and as a nation prosper most when our rate of growth is held within the bounds of our productive capacity. Perhaps in this town of investment advisors you believe that you can protect yourselves against inflation. Perhaps you can protect a small minority of our people for some period of time. But inevitably the well-being of your clients can not be divorced from the well-being of the nation as a whole. Parenthetically I might add that I do not envy those of you who are keeping your clients ahead of the game as "in and outers" in stocks that I can only rarely identify.

In conclusion, I would argue that the risks and perils that confront us are formidable but avoidable. The prudent course for this nation to follow is clearly set forth in the President's recommendations. I can only hope that next year as I join the litany "In Times of Prosperity . . . Good Lord Preserve Us," I will be referring to our moral fibre and not our national economic well-being.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 1967]

**PROFILE OF A BOOM: ECONOMIC EXPANSION ENTERS 80TH MONTH, MATCHES OLD RECORD—GNP SOARS 49 PERCENT SINCE 1961—PROFITS, PERSONAL INCOME RISE EVEN MORE SHARPLY—PROBLEMS: HOUSING AND GOLD**

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

If the current business expansion continues through next month, it will enter the record books as the longest boom in American history.

Even the more pessimistic forecasters are convinced that the expansion will indeed set

a record. The longest expansion until now has been the 80-month business boom that went on during most of World War II, ending in February 1945. The current expansion, which began in February 1961, is now entering its 80th month. Altogether, there have been 26 previous U.S. business expansions, according to records kept back to 1854 by the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research. The average length: A mere 30 months.

The full dimensions of the current expansion can be gauged by reviewing some of the changes that have taken place in the U.S. economy since 1961. The magnitude of these changes is impressive, as the following review shows.

Gross national product: At more than \$775 billion annually, the nation's output of goods and services has risen some \$255 billion since 1961. The gain alone dwarfs the annual GNP of such major nations as the United Kingdom, West Germany and France. The table below translates America's multibillion-dollar economic growth into percentage terms and also shows how rapidly the major components of the GNP total have risen during the great boom:

#### Percent gains since 1961

Gross national product.....	49
Consumer spending.....	46
Government spending.....	63
Business spending.....	47

Within the fast-expanding governmental category, the sharpest rise since 1961 has occurred in Federal nonmilitary expenditures, which have soared 77% in the period. Federal outlays for defense have climbed 52%, and overall Federal expenditures are up 56% since 1961. Spending by state and local governments has risen 70%—much faster than total Federal outlays.

Inflation, of course, accounts for part of the GNP rise since 1961. If "growth" stemming simply from higher prices is discounted, the "real" GNP increase since 1961 works out to 34%, rather than 49%.

The consumer-spending category is by far the largest of the various GNP components. This spending breaks down three ways—for durable goods such as appliances and autos, for nondurables such as food and clothing and for services such as medical care and rent. The table shows how the three subcategories have fared since 1961:

#### Percent gain since 1961

Durable Goods.....	64
Nondurable Goods.....	39
Services.....	48

Although spending for durables has risen fastest, the consumer still spends a good deal less for such products than for nondurables or services. Currently, consumers devote about 44% of their budgets to nondurables, 41% to services and only 15% to durable goods. Overall, the statistical breakdown for consumer spending indicates that the economy has not become as "service oriented" as is often suggested. In 1961, consumers spent about 40% of their budgets on services.

The 47% rise in business spending, of course, has brought a big increase in the capacity of the country's factories. U.S. plant capacity has grown by about a third since 1961. This admittedly is less than the dollar rise in business spending, but the capacity rise is based on physical volume of goods and therefore isn't "inflated" by rising prices.

As a result of the 33% capacity increase, U.S. manufacturers are able to produce a far greater volume of goods now than in 1961 without putting undue strain on their production facilities.

At present, U.S. factories are using about 85% of their capacity, on average, well below

the 90%-plus operating rates at which severe strains traditionally begin to show up. At operating rates above 90%, overtime costs rise sharply, and many producers are forced to use inefficient facilities that would otherwise stand idle or be scrapped.

Personal income: The rapidly rising earnings of most Americans have supplied much of the fuel for the economy's long climb since 1961. The personal income of Americans now exceeds \$631 billion annually, some \$215 billion more than the 1961 income total. The rise reflects a variety of factors, not just the steadily climbing wages and salaries of all sorts of workers. The table below lists the key income sources of Americans and shows how rapidly each category has risen since 1961:

#### Percent gain since 1961

Total personal income.....	51
Wages and salaries.....	53
Fringe benefits.....	86
Dividends.....	71
Interest income.....	87
Income from rent.....	26

As in the case of service spending noted above, the income record since 1961 holds some surprises. Landlords' income from rent has risen only half as fast as overall income, a fact that should surprise many tenants. And income from interest and dividends on investments has climbed much faster than income from wage and salary payments, a fact that may give some second thoughts to people who worry that labor is getting far more than its share of the income pie; fringe benefits paid to workers, however, have risen much faster than wages and salaries.

At present, dividend and interest payments make up about 11% of total personal income. This compares with only 9% in 1961. Wage and salary payments make up 67% of the total, about equal to 1961.

The overall rise in consumer income is considerable even if rising prices and an increasing population are taken into account. After-tax per-capita income in the second quarter reached a record annual rate of \$2,388 in terms of 1958 dollars. This was 25% higher than the comparable 1961 per-capita figure. In the view of many economists, this income measurement comes as close as anything to a "standard-of-living" index for the U.S.

Accompanying the big rise in consumer income has been a big rise in consumer savings. These savings have recently been running at an annual rate of about \$36 billion, up 70% from the 1961 level (a sharper rise than the 65% increase in consumer credit outstanding over the same period). Time deposits in commercial banks have attracted the largest share of these savings.

The rise in consumer income reflects a massive improvement in the U.S. employment picture during the economic expansion. Many more jobs exist, workers toil longer hours and pay levels are considerably higher.

Today, there are more than 76 million civilian jobs in the U.S., up from less than 66 million in 1961. The increase exceeds the population of New York, the nation's largest city. The rise in jobs not only has opened up work for the country's increasing population—there are 15 million more Americans now than in 1961—but has given work to millions who couldn't get jobs early in the decade. Unemployment in the nation is below the 3 million mark; in 1961, it was close to 5 million.

Employees generally work a longer week now than in 1961. In manufacturing, the average workweek of nearly 41 hours is almost a full hour longer than the 1961 workweek. In the construction trade, the average workweek has recently exceeded 38 hours, up from less than 37 in 1961. An exception: Re-



tailoring, where the average has dropped from more than 38 hours in 1961 to less than 36 recently. Factors in the retailing trend, say analysts, include the increasing use of part-time employees and self-service in stores.

Most employees, moreover, are receiving much more pay per hour. The average hourly pay level in manufacturing is about \$2.80, up from \$2.32 in 1961. In construction, the average is nearly \$4.10 an hour, some 90 cents higher than in 1961. In retailing, the average pay level is about \$2, up from \$1.68 at the start of the expansion.

**Corporate profits:** The climb of corporate profits during the long boom has been even more spectacular than the rise of consumer income. The before-tax earnings of U.S. companies currently total nearly \$80 billion a year, up from \$50 billion in 1961. Within the broad corporate category, however, there has been considerable variation between different types of industries. The table below shows the overall profits rise, plus the gains for particular groups:

*Percent gain since 1961*

Total corporate profits.....	57
Durable goods makers.....	85
Nondurable goods makers.....	49
Transport and utilities.....	51
Finance and miscellaneous.....	44

In 1961, the profits of durable-goods makers totaled some \$500 million less than those of nondurable-goods producers. Currently, however, durables firms are earning some \$3.3 billion a year more than nondurables companies. The big boom in auto-buying in recent years is a major factor in the profit rise for durables. It should be noted, however, that the durables group traditionally fares extra well in expansion periods and extra badly in recessions. The other categories listed above generally react less dramatically to changes in the overall course of business.

A footnote to the profits story: Since 1961, the after-tax earnings of corporations have climbed 71%, a considerably faster rise than the 57% gain in before-tax income. This, of course, reflects the 1964 income tax cut.

To be sure, the economic record of the U.S. since 1961 is not without blemishes.

**LAGGING HOME STARTS**

New-home starts last year totaled less than 1.2 million units, actually down from the 1961 level of 1.3 million units and far below the 1963 level of 1.6 million. In recent weeks, housing has shown some signs of a pickup, but the industry's record still stands in bleak contrast to the general economic boom since 1961.

In part, the housing industry's trouble reflects overbuilding at least of middle and upper income housing in the earlier post-World War II years. The mortgage funds for home building have been relatively scarce at times during the boom. Ironically, if other segments of the economy hadn't been so strong in recent years, there doubtless would have been more money available for home building, and the industry almost certainly would have fared better.

The U.S. gold supply also has declined during the long expansion. The Government's coffers now hold some \$13 billion of gold, down from more than \$17 billion at the beginning of the expansion.

Technically, this drop has occurred because the U.S. has been spending more dollars abroad than it has been taking in from foreigners. Foreign governments, in turn, have been buying U.S. gold with many of these dollars at the Treasury's offering price of \$35 per ounce, a price that many foreign officials apparently feel is a bargain.

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy.

If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teen-age Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom-time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

**IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL AID FOR THE POOR**

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the extent to which the poor can or should be given free legal assistance is currently under challenge in the State of California. In a recent article by the labor editor of the Los Angeles Times, the issues are quite clearly set forth.

The California rural legal assistance program, an OEO-funded nonprofit organization, has been charged by some writers with improper conduct for using Government funds to sue Government agencies. "A strange spectacle," to quote Governor Reagan.

But the right of the CRLA to bring proceedings against a Federal agency, which in its opinion is not complying with congressional mandates, has been heartily supported by the President of the American Bar Association, the courts, legal advisers to the assistance program, and the Department of Labor, which was itself a defendant in a suit instigated by CRLA.

There is nothing unique about Government money being used to finance two sides of a lawsuit. A very recent example is the suit brought by the Justice Department challenging the FCC's approval of the ITT-AP merger.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said during the past summer about the necessity of removing conflicts from the streets into the courts. CRLA helps toward this objective. The important role that the CRLA is playing in the effort to dispense justice equally is very well described in the following article.

By attacking the CLRA, the Republicans are once again playing politics with the legitimate needs of the poor. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to endorse the CLRA and associate myself with the following article from the Los Angeles Times. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Record:

**LEGAL AID TO POOR STIRS STATE FIGHT—CRITICS HIT USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS AGAINST GOVERNMENT UNITS**

(By Harry Bernstein)

The nation's largest legal aid program for the poor is under heavy attack in California, and the battle's outcome will set patterns for the entire country.

Gov. Reagan and U.S. Sen. George Murphy are leading the criticism of the California Rural Legal Assistance organization, a nonprofit corporation funded as part of the war on poverty through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The basic argument against CRLA is that it uses government money to challenge government rulings and government agencies. To those who oppose CRLA, the organization is an improper government creation because it is spending \$1.5 million a year in California alone and part of this is to attack the government.

**QUESTION ON CIVIL CASES**

Officers of CRLA answer the charges by proudly admitting it's true that lawyers, paid for by the government, are taking on cases from the poor and these cases, at times, challenge government decisions.

Should the government finance legal attacks against itself, at times? In criminal cases, an indigent is guaranteed a lawyer by the government to fight the government, but what about in civil cases?

The governor, in an address to the Republican State Central Committee meeting last Saturday in Anaheim, called the situation a strange "spectacle," and said in one instance CRLA is using taxpayer money to "harass a county welfare officer."

Indications now are that the governor will veto the next CRLA appropriation for \$1.5 million to finance its operations in the state for 1968.

The OEO in Washington can override the veto and give the money anyway, but so far CRLA has no assurances that this will be done.

**CITIZENS HORRIFIED**

And if California funds for the legal aid program are cut off because of the current argument, the same thing will happen in other parts of the country.

Sen. Murphy said California citizens "have been horrified by the spectacle of CRLA lawyers, paid by their tax dollars, going to court against the secretary of labor and his Justice Department attorneys, also paid by the taxpayers."

Murphy said CRLA has turned what was "a good and worthy proposal intended to help the poor into what seems to be an extension of the extremely long organizing arm of Mr. (Walter) Reuther and his allies in the farm unionization cause."

James D. Lorenz, Jr., a Harvard law school graduate who is the director of CRLA, says the whole point of the program is "to take the side of the poor in legal cases."

**EQUAL REPRESENTATION STRESSED**

"If we tell men and women without money that we will help them, but only in noncontroversial cases and cases which do not challenge government agencies or growers with political influence, then we might as well quit," Lorenz said in an interview.

"The people we are in contact with, and trying to help, know damn quickly whether we are there to help them or not."

"If we were to consistently refuse to take cases of merit on behalf of poor clients because they might result in controversy, our clients would know that they were not receiving representation equal to that enjoyed by people who can afford to hire lawyers."

And, Lorenz said, this unrestricted lawyer-

client relationship with the poor is the prime base of the legal aid program.

Murphy and other opponents of CRLA also say the organization is closely tied to labor unions, especially Cesar Chavez's AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

#### RIGHT TO CHALLENGE CITED

Therefore, the CRLA critics say, the organization is using government money to help unions, and this is unethical and improper.

The unions agree with CRLA in such cases as the fight against importation of the Mexican farm workers.

But CRLA says indigent farm workers themselves, who are eligible to get legal help from CRLA, cannot be denied the right to challenge government orders on their own, even if the union agrees.

And this is true, CRLA contends, even though in theory the CRLA could tell an eligible client to go to his union or elsewhere for help.

It isn't up to CRLA to get rid of a client by referring him to a union or a company for help if he comes to CRLA, Lorenz said.

The union may be pleased with the CRLA case results, but that should not mean that CRLA cannot take on such cases just because a private organization is interested or pleased with the results, he said.

Chavez is a member of CRLA's board of directors, and it's no secret that the organization works with the union on occasions.

#### WELL-KNOWN LEADER

"How could it be otherwise?" asks Lorenz, who says Chavez is obviously a well-known leader among Mexican-Americans and among farm workers, and it would be impossible to ignore him or his union.

The battle over CRLA has already moved to the national level.

Latest move came from the special advisory committee set up by OEO to advise it on the entire legal services program around the country.

The advisory committee, which includes the present and past presidents of the American Bar Assn., as well as the ABA president-elect, strongly defended CRLA's role.

#### NO HELP TO PROGRAM

It said the entire program could not be "wisely or effectively served" if cases against the government were forbidden.

The committee then unanimously praised lawyers in the poverty program for "meeting their professional responsibilities," and called on OEO to "resist efforts to restrict the program."

Lorenz said he and the 30 other lawyers, working for CRLA have handled 4,600 cases since it was started 15 months ago.

Only three have provoked major controversy so far.

The first was when CRLA represented poor clients who challenged the cutbacks made by Gov. Reagan in California's Medi-Cal program.

The governor was known to be furious about the allegations made by CRLA lawyers that his cutback of funds to Medi-Cal were illegal.

He was even more upset when Superior Court Judge Irving Perluss blocked the cuts at CRLA's request pending further hearings.

The validity of CRLA legal charges that Reagan improperly cut Medi-Cal funds is still being tested in the courts.

But CRLA insists that the poor are hurt by such cuts and as lawyers for several indigent users of Medi-Cal, CRLA has an obligation to do everything it can for those clients.

The second case was CRLA's challenge of the Department of Labor decision to let 8,100

Mexican nationals come into California to help harvest tomatoes.

Reagan said "Even Labor Secretary (W. Willard) Wirtz, no friend of California farmers, approved the effort to bring in the (Mexican) workers."

"So we have the spectacle of a federal government body (CRLA) opposing the decision of an officer of the President's Cabinet," the governor said.

Again, CRLA not only admits it is challenging the Department of Labor, but says such a move is a vital part of its operations.

Here's what happened in the farm labor case:

The California Department of Employment said there is a need for supplemental foreign labor to help harvest tomatoes. The U.S. Department of Labor approved.

Then CRLA got a court order blocking the importation of the Mexicans on grounds that there are jobless U.S. citizens available for the work and that some tomato growers were not meeting the minimum standards set by the government to qualify them for foreign labor.

An out-of-court settlement of the argument was reached, and the court injunction was dismissed.

#### MERIT SEEN

The out-of-court settlement between CRLA and the labor department provided that the Mexicans would come in, but also said, in writing, that current regulations would be more adequately enforced.

CRLA says its prime purpose was to make certain that there is compliance with state and federal laws.

"The fact that the Department of Labor finally entered into a settlement agreement to better insure that the law would be enforced is a clear indication that the suit we filed had considerable merit," Lorenz said.

The CRLA case also won the support of the federal judge who issued the injunction against the Department of Labor.

Harold Horowitz, UCLA law professor and member of the national advisory committee to OEO, likened the case to a situation where a private corporation challenges a government ruling.

#### REPUBLICAN'S VIEW

"Obviously, no one would want the corporation to be prevented from challenging the government ruling in the courts. It should be equally obvious that indigent workers should be allowed to do the same thing, and, if the process of law is going to work, the poor should not be prevented from doing so because of a lack of funds," he said.

Maynard Toll, of the law firm of O'Melveny and Meyers, is also a member of the legal advisory committee to OEO.

He said that "as a life-long Republican, I find it incongruous for Republicans to be attacking a concept of providing legal counsel to people in danger of having their rights engulfed by big government."

"I thought that was part of the Republican philosophy."

"It must be understood that the system of justice we have is based on the idea that all citizens are entitled to legal services, and this must include legal squabbles with government since these squabbles sometimes tend to make up a pretty good share of a poor person's legal problems," he said.

The governor is getting no support from the Department of Labor either, even though it was one agency which the governor said is being abused by CRLA.

Glenn Brockway, regional director of the department in San Francisco, declared: "Naturally, I do not feel CRLA needed to go to court to stop the importation of the Mexi-

can nationals. I believe our ruling was correct in the first place."

But, Brockway quickly added: "Certainly CRLA lawyers had every right to defend their clients just as if they were private lawyers. They have the right to take on me or anyone else in government in pursuing the interests of their clients."

CRLA has submitted its specific charges against certain growers who are accused of refusing to recruit domestic workers in addition to an alleged failure to pay the required minimum wages and to meet other U.S. standards.

The Department of Labor is now investigating the charges.

#### SUTTER COUNTY CASE

The other CRLA case to bring major protests was in Sutter County, which was also referred to by Reagan in an address last Saturday.

Reagan said the CRLA is using government funds to harass a county welfare office "to the point where that county's Board of Supervisors has had to use the taxpayers' money to hire a lawyer at \$35 an hour to protect its county welfare director."

Reagan said the director saved the county \$200,000 in welfare costs last year, and in the eyes of some of these people, saving taxpayers' money is a crime."

Before Reagan made his charge, the Sutter County Taxpayers Assn. said taxpayers there "strongly object to and detest the work being done by CRLA."

#### STOP FUNDS

And the Sutter County Board of Supervisors asked OEO in Washington to stop all CRLA funds.

CRLA says its involvement began in April when four farmworkers asked for legal help in their efforts to get aid from the Sutter County Welfare Department.

The Department, headed by Mrs. Mary Quitoriano, had rejected their request for help. The four were also told they were not eligible for any aid program administered by the California State Department of Social Welfare.

Charges were filed by CRLA alleging the four and others were improperly denied help and were not accurately informed of their rights.

"Even Gov. Reagan's own state welfare director, John Montgomery, sent letters of reprimand to Sutter County officials for refusing to allow the poor to apply for welfare," according to Lorenz, who added:

"And of the 10 decisions handed down so far in that case, our clients have won all 10 of them. Clearly, the cases were not frivolous."

#### WELFARE CRACKDOWN

The CRLA said Mrs. Quitoriano was hired by Sutter County supervisors in the first place as part of a "crackdown on welfare cases."

And the supervisors there, CRLA said, "were the same men who refused to continue the local mental health program and refused to approve other poverty programs on the grounds that there is no poverty in Sutter County."

But the strongest argument CRLA has is the statement from Montgomery, who, as Reagan's appointee, "should have straightened the governor out," the CRLA said.

Montgomery, in a written report, said Sutter County officials were not following practices "in accordance with the law."

Nor had the officials there taken corrective actions "sufficient to meet the responsibilities of local government on conserving and utilizing the human resources so necessary to our modern economic and social system," the Montgomery report said.



# TEAM OF SURGEONS FROM LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE GOES TO GREECE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning an unusual venture in international goodwill and meaningful foreign aid will begin when a seven-man heart team from San Bernardino County, Calif., leaves Washington for Greece to perform lifesaving heart surgery on Greek adults and children, and conduct teaching sessions for the thoracic surgeons of that country.

This team from Loma Linda University School of Medicine, on a 6-week mission away from the United States, will perform a heavy schedule of open-heart surgery during their stay in Greece. More than 2,000 pounds of special heart surgery equipment will accompany the team on its lifesaving, people-to-people program for the Greek people.

The purpose of this humanitarian trip to Greece is twofold—to offer the benefits of open-heart surgery to as many of the Greek people as possible and to demonstrate the techniques of open-heart surgery to Greek doctors, thereby helping them to start their own programs. The team will conduct a program of lectures, seminars, and demonstrations for the Greek physicians.

We hear much debate on this floor about foreign aid programs which cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. It is refreshing to me to note that there are still Americans who believe that the best kind of foreign aid is the kind that does not cost the American taxpayers one thin dime, but involves people of this country with the people of other countries on a person-to-person basis with love, charity, and humanitarianism the only goals.

The Loma Linda project erases the "ugly American" concept and will give the man on the street in Greece a favorable attitude toward Americans because what is being done for their people is being done by Americans whose only motivation is the desire to do good and cannot be cataloged as aid in the form of money backed by the concept that we can buy friends around the world.

Heading the heart team on this clinical tour is Dr. Ellsworth E. Wareham, of Oak Glen, Calif., professor of surgery at Loma Linda University School of Medicine. Dr. Wilfred M. Huse, of Grand Terrace, Calif., assistant professor of surgery, is the team's second surgeon. Dr. C. Joan Coggin of Loma Linda, Calif., assistant professor of medicine, is the team's pediatric cardiologist. Other members of the team are school of nursing instructor Lavaun W. Sutton of Redlands, Calif.; cardiologist, Dr. Roy V. Jutzy of Loma Linda, assistant professor of medicine; Dr. Berfnard D. Briggs,

Loma Linda, professor of anesthesiology; Mr. Raymond M. Savage, Loma Linda heart-lung machine technician; and John Parrish of Loma Linda, director of public information at the university, will accompany the medical personnel as general administrative secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Loma Linda University School of Medicine and their heart mission team for the vital role they are playing in reaching and uplifting mankind everywhere, and I am sure that these ambassadors of good will will leave a tremendous impact upon the people of Greece.

## VISIT OF HEART SURGERY TEAM FROM LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY TO GREECE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Pettis] has just said concerning the forthcoming visit of a team of heart surgeons from Loma Linda University to Greece for the purpose of performing a number of cardiac operations in Athens.

I have worked with the gentleman from California on this project and I have been greatly impressed by his dedication and concern that the visit of this group of outstanding American physicians be expeditiously and effectively conducted.

The humanitarian impact of a mission of this kind must be obvious. The heart patients who will receive the benefit of the skills of these surgeons will be given a better chance for a healthy life.

The opportunity that will be afforded to Greek physicians to observe this heart surgery will expand medical knowledge in Greece and thus multiply the benefits of this visit.

I believe that Loma Linda University is to be greatly commended for its dedication and leadership in this endeavor.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that last month I had the privilege of visiting the medical center in Athens, at which these operations are shortly to be performed, Evangelismos Hospital, and of talking to the head of the hospital, Dr. Thomas A. Doxiades, and I can say, therefore, from firsthand knowledge that the forthcoming mission will be greeted with great enthusiasm and appreciation.

I might add, finally, Mr. Speaker, that the visit of the Loma Linda heart surgeons is one more instance of the close links that have for so many years existed between the people of the United States and the people of Greece.

Again, I want to commend Congressman PETTIS, who was vice president of Loma Linda University before coming to Congress, on his outstanding effort in this matter.

## VISIT OF HEART SURGEONS TO GREECE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I add my personal and professional congratulations to the group here in Washington that is proceeding to Greece, according to the well-stated narratives of the two preceding speakers in the well. Indeed, these men prove that "M.D." stands for "medical diplomat."

## CONGRESS MUST PROVIDE A DETERRENT TO THOSE WHO ORGANIZE AND PREACH VIOLENT CIVIL DISTURBANCE BY PASSING H.R. 421

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, this Nation witnessed, and the world watched, an attack on the Pentagon itself, the spitting in the faces of our soldiers, the throwing of bottles and debris at Federal uniformed officials.

The Communist countries headlined this massive effort at disruption of the operation of Government in the United States.

The undisputed organizers included the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, a Communist-front organization; the Progressive Labor Party, who support Communist China; the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, followers of Stokely Carmichael who preaches rebellion and anarchy from Communist countries; and joined by the New Left, an activist ultraliberal group preaching violent civil disturbance and mouthing support for the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front against which American men are fighting in the swamps and jungles of South Vietnam.

Congress was quick to pass a stiff law against disrupting Government on Capitol Hill, which I cosponsored.

But Congress, or at least the Senate, is reluctant to pass much-needed antiriot and antiviolent civil disturbance laws similar to my antiriot bill, H.R. 421, which is tied up in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It is imperative that Congress pass this bill so that the organizers and instigators of future marches that end up in violence and disruption of the people's Government can be punished as the criminals they are. It is imperative that Congress speak out in unmistakable condemnation of organized anarchy in America, in support of full FBI authority to investigate this insidious plot of rebellion, in sup-

port of full and forceful prosecution of those who organize massive civil disobedience anarchy, and in support of law-enforcement efforts to protect the governmental institutions at all levels and on all fronts.

The march on the Pentagon last weekend gave the Communist enemies in South Vietnam and around the world more aid and comfort—by making it falsely appear that many in America are not really behind our fighting men in Vietnam—than any major victory on the battlefield could provide.

My bill would put not only Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown out of business, but would end the Communist-oriented activities of those who organized the march on the Pentagon, such as Dave Dellinger, a supporter of Red China who visited North Vietnam and Communist China late last year, with Ho Chi Minh early this year and who went to Cuba in 1964; such as Jerry Rubin, a leader of the free speech movement at Berkeley, who disrupted the HUAC meeting in August 1966, and was an observer at the 1966 convention of the Communist Party USA and visited Cuba illegally in 1964; such as Ivanhoe Donaldson, director of SNCC in New York and an observer at the 1966 Communist Party USA convention; and such as Mrs. Dagmar Wilson who traveled to North Vietnam.

A further challenge is offered to Congress by Martin Luther King who is following up his conversion to the activist movement when he advocated massive civil disobedience and the disruption of government at all levels by his use yesterday of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to call for a massive "camp-in," intended to bring Government to a halt in Washington.

Intentional, planned, and massive disruption of the operation of the U.S. Government, that has the duty of serving all the people, is anarchy. Those who organize such massive disobedience to law and order should be put on notice that such action will be punished.

I call on Congress to act now before the organizers of anarchy have another chance to invade Washington or any other seat of government. It is the duty of Congress to pass stiff anti-riot, anti-civil disturbance legislation which already passed the House, 349 to 70, if the most noble experiment in man's governing of himself in freedom, the United States of America, is to be preserved.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY TAX FUND

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recent threats to either cut back or withhold highway construction funds not only have no basis in written statute but violate longstanding and

near-unanimous congressional intent. Careful reading of the 1956 debate, when the highway trust fund was established, shows plainly that the will and desire of the Congress was to guarantee this construction money to the States without interruption.

H.R. 10660, which became Public Law 84-627, the Highway Act of 1956, passed the House by a vote of 399 to 19, in itself evidence of the overwhelming support for the concepts of this legislation. The following statements made at the time by Members of both parties are indicative of a sentiment which has not changed:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The public realizes it will have to pay the increased taxes no matter upon what industries or articles they may be levied. The public also knows that you spend the money in building the roads and they will pay for them and nonetheless will bless you for the benefits conferred upon them in according them safe means of highway transportation.

The American people are on the verge of having their highway problem settled.

Its fundamental provisions—the allotment of Federal aid to the several road systems of the 48 States and the tax schedule which will finance that aid—have been intelligently prepared and are almost unanimously approved by everyone who understands the highway problem and its solution.

The passage of this bill is in the national interest.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. The subject of my remarks on this occasion is roads. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin in 1808, had this to say of highway construction: "No other single operation within the power of government can more effectively tend to strengthen and perpetuate that union, which secures external independence, domestic peace, and internal liberty."

Mr. GEORGE. One thing that was stymieing the people of the country was not the fact that they were not paying enough taxes for highway construction, but the big end of our trouble was gasoline taxes were being diverted on the national level to pay general operating expenses.

Mr. REED. I believe that it is important to emphasize that the bill provides for the establishment of a highway trust fund. The receipts from the taxes levied to finance this program will be required to be placed in this trust fund. The existence of this fund will insure that these receipts will not be diverted to other purposes. Moreover, it will make it easier for the Congress as well as the public to know exactly how much the program is costing and to determine to what extent the costs are being met on a pay-as-we-build basis.

Mr. BOGGS. No. 1: The creation of the so-called highway trust fund. For a great many years now highway users have complained, and I think with some justification since the conclusion of World War II and the Korean conflict, that vast revenues were being collected from them but were not being used for purposes of building highways. This bill recognizes that complaint and it establishes the highway trust fund which dedicates most of these funds to highway construction and for that purpose only.

Mr. BOGGS. Thus, for the first time, the American motorist will pay these taxes with the assurance that he will be the direct beneficiary of every penny which he pays and he will pay with the knowledge that every cent derived from these taxes will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety.

Mr. KEAN. Fourth. If the proceeds of these

taxes went into the general revenue fund there would be a false budget picture. We do not want to balance the budget with these taxes. In the early days of the program it is probable that more money will be collected than will be needed, but in the long run every nickel will be necessary. If these taxes went into the general revenue, it would result in a false picture of the budget. These taxes might serve to balance the budget in the next couple of years, and then unbalance it when the money to actually build the roads was called for. We do not want to do this.

In general, putting all of the proceeds of these taxes in such a trust fund to be used for the road program only should make us at all times know exactly where we stand.

Mr. MILLER. The certainty resulting from the trust fund concept permits the administration to plan future budgets in reliance upon fixed highway expenditures and with the knowledge that revenue will be provided without resort to deficit financing.

Those remarks were taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1956, when the House was debating the Highway Act of 1956. Congressional intent has seldom been more clear.

I also wish to quote briefly from the United States Code, title 23, "Highways," chapter 1, section 126. This section is titled "Diversion" and states:

It is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways.

It is just exactly that—unfair and unjust—and to remedy this injustice to the American motorist, I am introducing legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes that are earmarked for the highway trust fund.

If the American motorist is not going to be able to reap the benefits of the taxes he pays, then the administration has no right to collect them. If and when the administration indicates it is ready to deal in good faith with the Congress, the States, and the American highway users on this matter, then this legislation will no longer be necessary.

#### FREE WORLD FLAG SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, of the many aspects of the war in Vietnam that are of deepening concern to the American people, one of the most disturbing has been our failure to stop the flow of supplies supporting the Hanoi war economy as well as Vietcong and North Vietnamese units in the south. For over 2 years now I have urged that more effective steps be taken to deny the enemy these supplies, particularly those carried to North Vietnam in ships flying the flags of free world countries.

While some progress has been made



to reduce the level of free world traffic, a persistent and appreciable amount continues to exist. According to the State Department, they have done all they can to eliminate it. In the face of this some may be satisfied to simply try to pretend the problem no longer exists. I, for one, on the other hand, contend that more effective ways and means can and must be found. The administration, has, I submit, devoted too much of its attention and energy toward rationalizing inaction instead of decisively facing up to the hard realities of the conflict. What is needed is not an apology for this traffic but effective action to stop it completely.

A cold review of the facts will quickly indicate why still more must yet be done about the enemy's seaborne sources of supply. I have now been provided by the Department of Defense with information concerning the number of ship arrivals in North Vietnam during September of this year, as follows:

MERCHANT SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM BY FLAG OF REGISTRY, JUNE 1965 TO SEPTEMBER 1967

Date of arrival	Free world	U.S.S.R.	East European	Chinese	Total
June 1965.....	23	6	5	9	43
July.....	20	7	4	8	39
August.....	12	7	3	15	37
September.....	11	3	3	8	25
October.....	15	4	4	11	34
November.....	14	7	6	16	43
December.....	13	10	4	14	41
January 1966.....	18	9	5	15	47
February.....	12	10	1	14	37
March.....	6	12	4	13	35
April.....	7	11	2	11	31
May.....	6	9	5	5	25
June.....	5	12	3	9	29
July.....	1	13	3	9	26
August.....	3	11	1	7	22
September.....	4	7	5	10	26
October.....	2	8	7	13	30
November.....	6	9	3	14	32
December.....	11	11	6	15	36
January 1967.....	6	16	5	11	38
February.....	5	25	4	10	44
March.....	3	24	5	12	44
April.....	5	18	4	9	36
May.....	9	18	2	10	39
June.....	11	9	3	11	34
July.....	5	10	2	5	22
August.....	6	12	1	3	22
September.....	7	8	2	8	25
Total.....	239	306	102	285	932

CARGO CAPACITY OF FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1967

Month	British		Cyprus		Maltese		Italian		Total	
	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage	Number	Dead weight tonnage
January.....	6	48,850							6	48,850
February.....	3	10,730	1	10,900	1	10,900			5	32,530
March.....	3	10,700							3	10,700
April.....	4	24,800	1	10,900					5	35,700
May.....	7	32,220	1	10,600	1	10,900			9	53,720
June.....	9	57,620	1	10,800			1	10,000	11	78,420
July.....	5	26,430							5	26,430
August.....	4	25,520	1	10,600	1	10,900			6	47,020
September.....	6	49,730					1	10,000	7	50,730
Total.....	47	286,600	5	53,000	3	32,700	2	20,000	57	384,100

Let us look first of all at the free world flagships. During September, seven such vessels, six British and one Italian flag, arrived in North Vietnam, representing a cargo capacity of some 50,730 tons. This brings the total for the first three quarters of 1967 to 57 free world ship arrivals, with a total cargo capacity of over 380,000 tons.

Comparing the level of traffic during 1966 and 1967 by quarters shows that the number of arrivals is again on the increase; and that there is every indication that the 1967 level of traffic will be approximately equal to if not more than that of 1966.

FREE WORLD FLAGSHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

	1966		1967	
	Number of arrivals	Cumulative total	Number of arrivals	Cumulative total
1st quarter.....	36	36	14	14
2d quarter.....	18	54	25	39
3d quarter.....	8	62	18	57
4th quarter.....	12	74		

In other words, this year there has been little or no progress in reducing this traffic further, to say nothing of eliminating it.

To emphasize the persistent nature of this traffic, I would point out that of the seven ships arriving in September, six of these have made a total of 32 voyages to North Vietnam since January 1966.

To indicate the importance of the

goods that ships flying free world flags have brought to North Vietnam, I would point out that in 6 of the first 9 months of this year cargoes have included suspected or known strategic goods. I would further stress that despite the administration's insistence that free world ships do not carry any goods of importance to the war effort that, according to the classified information made available to me by the Department of Defense, we simply do not know the nature of the cargoes in the holds of a great many of these ships.

The Pentagon estimates that as much as 10 percent of all goods imported by North Vietnam originate from free world sources. What is more, if I can believe what I am told, some free world flag ships also carry Communist goods; consequently, these vessels provide the transportation for an even greater percentage of the total imports.

Mr. Speaker, the recent bombing strikes in the Haiphong area are, of course, a clear indication of the importance of that port to the enemy. In testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee released this month, the Secretary of Defense acknowledged that 80 percent to 85 percent of all North Vietnam imports come by sea, and that Haiphong is the "easiest and cheapest means of import."

In the course of the same hearings the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earl G. Wheeler, revealed that—

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have advocated that we should find a way of obstructing or stopping the flow of war-making materials and other supplies through the major ports.

I would particularly point out that this statement underscores the importance of denying the war economy of Hanoi not only what may be technically called "warmaking materials" but also "other supplies" as well.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff know what is keeping this war going and have called for the closing of the port of Haiphong. The question is whether or not the administration is really interested in taking decisive action to stop once and for all this source of supply for the enemy.

#### THE FUTURE OF THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, both the President and the Congress are now actively involved in looking for new ways of cutting expenditures. This is not a time when it is possible or sensible to undertake a large number of new Federal programs and there may be some legiti-

mate question about maintaining certain existing programs at their current or proposed level of funding. The Congress must certainly be particularly active in the area of appraising the relative priority of the large number of funding requests which are placed before it, and reductions must and will be made. At the same time, I do not think that the Congress or the President should consider the abandonment of existing programs which have proven to be essential.

In particular, I wish to refer to the cropland adjustment program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I cannot agree with the action of the House of Representatives in recommending that the program be temporarily suspended. For one thing, I feel that this places the future of the conservation reserve, or soil bank type or program, in jeopardy and I feel that this is a step which deserves very serious reconsideration.

Throughout the Nation there are still some 11 million acres of farmland under conservation reserve program contracts. As land comes out from under these contracts it may, and probably will, be put to another use if a similar program is not in existence to provide the opportunity for continued diversion of this land from production of surplus crops on a long-term basis.

In 1966 \$30 million was made available for these cropland adjustment contracts representing about 2 million acres of land and composed of 36,000 individual contracts. In 1967 the appropriation totaled \$50 million. The acceptance of this program by the farmers as a means of rationally controlling production at a fair price to the farmer has been clearly demonstrated by the ever-increasing number of them that have entered into such contracts. Many Members of Congress received letters and telephone calls from their constituents wanting to know about the availability of funds and the rules of eligibility.

The cropland adjustment program provides tangible benefits for both the farm and the nonfarm sectors of the economy. For urban and suburban citizens it is a bargain in preserving open spaces and in helping to keep the food markets of the Nation on a stable basis. The public gets a real dollar bargain out of this program compared to other means of holding land out of the production of surplus crops. In 1966, for example, corn producers received an average of \$38.89 per acre in diversion payments on a 1-year basis. In contrast to this, they received \$24.03 per acre for long-range diversion under the cropland adjustment program. Feed grain producers receive \$25.56 per acre on a 1-year basis under the feed grain program and \$15.55 per acre under the long-term cropland adjustment program.

Thus, the taxpayer pays less. While the individual farmer received less per year under this type of long-term arrangement, it provided him the very real benefit of an assured income over a long period of time and a basis for consistent planning of the use of his other agricultural resources.

Thus, I believe that everyone in the Nation benefits from this program through its preventing overproduction,

market instability, and the accompanying expenses of dumping, Government control, and surplus storage.

On August 24 of this year I wrote a letter expressing my concern to the members of the House-Senate conference committee providing information on the impact of this program in my congressional district. I would like to include the text of this letter as a part of my remarks:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am taking this opportunity to communicate with you on the subject of the proposed 1968 Cropland Program appropriation, which is now before your Conference Committee (H.R. 10509).

As you know, the Senate has provided over \$52 million for new CAP contracts while the House has provided no money. Reviewing the House Committee report (House Report 330, page 4, pages 45-47), it appears that the reason for the recommendation of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, as subsequently accepted by the House, was a feeling that withdrawal of cropland from production would be inappropriate at this time in view of the reduction of our national stockpiles and increased domestic and foreign demands for food products.

I can understand the feeling that the proposed withdrawal of additional land from crop production should be reviewed with care. However, I think there is a distinction between a program which would withdraw large amounts of land from current production and a program which will carry forward the sound policy of keeping marginal land out of production.

I would like to refer to the specific example of the situation in the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Figures available for the two years of CAP in the Third Congressional District indicate that in 1966, 184 contracts representing 35,993 acres were signed and that in 1967, 207 contracts representing an additional 48,277 acres were signed. I suggest that these figures be compared with the following figures indicating the amount of land on which soil bank contracts will be expiring in the Third Congressional District during the next three years:

1967-----	2,018 contracts, 682,000 acres
1968-----	1,706 contracts, 586,000 acres
1969-----	264 contracts, 85,000 acres

I believe that a comparison of these figures reveals the very drastic effect which reduction in the CAP Program will have in bringing land which has been withdrawn from production over a long period of time back into production. In short, the decision not to make additional funds available to expand the CAP Program would represent an active decision to bring thousands of acres of marginal farm land in southeastern Colorado alone back to production.

I have checked carefully with individuals who are familiar with the situation in southeastern Colorado and the best information that I can obtain indicates that as much as 50% of this marginal farm land which was withdrawn under soil bank contracts would go back into production under the House version of the bill. In our area of the country this means that severe wind erosion in dry years would result.

I must advise the Committee that it is the opinion of many farmers in the area that bringing this land back into production will create a long-term problem of erosion and marginal farm income and that the continuing withdrawal of this land from production is a desirable objective.

I appreciate your attention to the above comments and would certainly be glad to make additional information available to the Committee.

Most sincerely yours,

FRANK E. EVANS,  
Member of Congress.

## A PLEA FOR RELIEF FOR THOSE WHO SUFFERED IN THE GREAT DISASTER ALONG THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious I am again speaking on the matter which concerns me most at this time—the great disaster that hit my beautiful district along the Rio Grande in the form of Hurricane Beulah and ensuing floods.

Homes were destroyed. Possessions were lost. The savings of a lifetime were swept away. The Lord was good that there was no loss of life along the Rio Grande, usually a lazy old stream carrying little water. But when, about a month ago, fed by flood swollen rivers, the Rio Grande rampaged, devastation was left behind.

People save, buy their homes, furnish their homes, provide the little extras along the way, clothing for work, play, and the kids at school, some of the necessities of life where they could be afforded, the necessities always.

To try to help these people help themselves, I yesterday introduced House Resolution 954 to refer a private bill for relief from these damages to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims. The private bill is H.R. 13642, for the relief of Jesus J. Rodriguez, who lost practically everything he owned in the disaster.

Mr. Speaker, this is no more than an effort on my part to afford a forum for these people who have nowhere else to go, nowhere to turn, no one from whom to seek assistance than our Government. The Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims will listen to their claims. He will make his recommendations to the Congress based on what he sees and hears.

As the House knows, this legislative route is known as the congressional reference. This measure was enacted last Congress. As far as I know, this is the first time the procedure has been utilized for an action of this magnitude.

I am hopeful, naturally. Hopeful that a compassionate government will find for reparations, that it will be mindful that these people are not looking for handouts, that they want someone to get down there to see their plight and make the determination therefrom.

## DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the imminent meeting of the House-Senate conference to resolve public works appropriations questions in-



cluding whether or not \$1.6 million will be provided the Corps of Engineers to complete planning for the Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the fact that those conservation groups which have studied this issue "on the ground" now stand in firm opposition to construction of Dickey Dam. The opposition of these groups stems from their determination that one of America's truly great wild rivers of major proportions shall not be destroyed as a wildland recreation resource.

Their position is summed up in this statement, adopted by the governing council of the Wilderness Society at the national conservation organization's annual meeting at Camp Phoenix, Sourdnauk Lake, Maine, earlier this month:

The Wilderness Society is opposed to the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School dams in view of the wilderness and free-flowing characteristics of the St. John River and because alternate sources of power are available nearer to the prime markets in this region.

Members should note that the council of the Wilderness Society arrived at this conclusion—that it should place its 40,000-member national organization on record as opposed to Dickey Dam—only after comprehensive discussion of the issue with Maine conservationists and firsthand observation of the damsite and the entire length of the St. John River itself. It then joined the Appalachian Mountain Club, the Massachusetts Audubon Society, and other State and regional conservation groups familiar with the issue in their opposition to Dickey Dam.

The Dickey project, located on the St. John River above its confluence with the Allagash, calls for construction of a 2-mile-long dam at the hamlet of Dickey, with five smaller earthen dams and a regulation dam at the Lincoln School site. These dams in combination would create a reservoir covering about 88,600 acres—approximately 136 square miles.

The St. John River above Dickey is one of the longest remaining stretches of relatively wild, undeveloped rivers in the eastern United States. The country is best described as remote; it is "near wilderness," being lumbered in areas and with some open farm country and small hamlets but for the most part removed from all signs of civilization. The river provides excellent canoeing with stretches of rapids. The total present canoe run of about 90 miles would be cut back by approximately 30 miles if the proposed reservoir comes into being.

Sound conservation reasons exist for opposing this project on the basis of irreparable damage which would be done to wildlife and to future recreational possibilities. The St. John River above Dickey is one of the longest remaining stretches of relatively wild undeveloped rivers in the eastern United States. Furthermore, in recent years, the recreational use of the adjacent Allagash has reached such proportions that increased recreational use of the St. John is almost bound to occur in an effort to escape overcrowding.

The only argument offered in the Dickey project's defense is that, instead of destroying the Allagash as well as the

Upper St. John River Valley as the once proposed Rankin Rapids project would have done, Dickey-Lincoln would only destroy the Upper St. John River Valley. To the increasing number of Americans concerned with preserving scenic and wild lands, this is not a responsive, responsible answer.

The St. John River rises above Moosehead Lake in northern Maine, and flows northward to become the boundary line between Maine and Canada. Although the St. John is quiet, almost lazy in its beginnings, it soon becomes a thing of speed and direction. In its upper reaches, particularly in the 50-mile stretch that would be flooded out by Dickey Reservoir, it swirls and boils, smooths out, and races on again, just as it did thousands of years ago. Endless square miles of forests spread out from its banks forming a canopy of uninterrupted peace and solitude for deer, bear, moose, and wide variety of bird and wildlife.

All this would be destroyed forever by the Dickey powerplant reservoir. The swaths cut through the deep Maine woods by its sprawling project roads, transmission switchyards and substations, and towering, extra-high-voltage lines and towers, represent an additional equally irremedial desecration.

Dickey-Lincoln would be constructed solely for power purposes. It is totally unnecessary. As the U.S. Supreme Court recently observed in Udall, Secretary of the Interior, against FPC, in reversing an FPC project license on the Snake River:

A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure; preservation of the reaches of the river affected . . . [may] be more desirable and in the public interest than the proposed development—

Further—

nuclear power will shortly be alternative sources of supply.

This is the position of the conservationists regarding Dickey Dam, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that the public works appropriations conferees will take it into serious account in their deliberations.

#### MAJ. DON HOLLEDER

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days nationwide attention has been focused on the anti-war demonstrations at the Pentagon. That this gives a distorted view of American public opinion is an understatement, and I feel it is particularly unfair to the hundreds of thousands of brave men fighting in Vietnam. These are the men who should receive our praise and attention, for they daily risk their lives so that we can remain safe at home.

In a recent article, syndicated columnist Col. Earl "Red" Blaik tells of one of these brave men, Maj. Don Hollender, who recently made the supreme sacrifice

for his country. Blaik's moving story of this young man is the kind of tribute we should all pay to our fighting men in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Colonel Blaik's article:

(By Col. Earl (Red) Blaik)

Last week I read where Washington witnessed the march of 70,000 peace demonstrators whose object was to "confront the war makers in Washington and to surround the Pentagon as the symbol of evil."

What these demonstrators failed to comprehend is that the career soldier does not commit this country to war—war is the judgment of our civilian leaders elected and appointed. The Pentagon implements this judgment and the career soldier is the one whose duty it is to answer the call of his country—not to question why. These men, in going to war, leave youngsters and wives with a smile, but more often with heavy hearts as they realize there may be no return. For demonstrators to suggest that the men of the regular military service want war and the Pentagon is a symbol of evil is to forget that Sherman said, "War Is Hell" and that MacArthur eloquently stated in taking the Japanese surrender on the U.S.S. Missouri, "It is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding—a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish—freedom, tolerance, justice."

Military men abhor war as they know it in the raw and to them the action of the belligerent demonstrator is incomprehensible.

I am greatly saddened by the news that Major Don Hollender of Army football fame, has been killed in Viet Nam. Holly, like so many fine young Americans, made the supreme sacrifice in terrain better suited to wallowing barnyard stock. War, to Holly, meant leaving a lovely wife, four children and a devoted mother.

Last December, in accepting the Gold Medal Award of The National Football Foundation, I referred directly to only one former Army player and that reference was to Hollender. You will better understand this brave young officer and his dedication to duty from those remarks which follow.

Axiom—Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless. The 1955 season was most trying for me as we had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All America End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blak's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Hollender at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left Hollender came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back, but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Hollender. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—it wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

This priceless leader is now the late Major Don Hollender.

#### THE BOGOTÁ CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION—AN OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE COMMUNITY ACTION AS A FORM OF CAPITAL FORMATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the Fourth Annual Conference of the Bolivarian Nations on Community Development, which meets in Bogotá, Colombia, on November 5. The weeklong meeting will be devoted to evaluation of community action programs in Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela.

This meeting results from the interest of the Pan American Union and the Organization of American States in community action as an instrument of development. Significantly, it is the product of Latin American leaders. These conferences were initiated in 1964 under the leadership of the Department of Social Affairs of the Union to further the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

Latin America has been divided into three regions for this purpose. In addition to this group, there are the Central American and southern groups incorporating the other nations of the Alliance. Each group meets annually to explore and expand the utilization of community action in support of national development. These are working meaningful conferences of the actual leaders and technicians who direct national programs.

The Bolivarian meeting is of particular significance because it brings together the directors of the oldest and most successful community action programs in the New World. Dr. Vicente Pizano Restrepo, of Colombia; and Dr. Carola Ravel, of Venezuela. These programs, as I have noted before—on pages 6368, 8632, and 20292—have made major

contributions to internal development since their respective inception in 1958 and 1960.

The experience and performance of these programs covers an adequate period of time to provide a reliable basis for evaluation of community action and its future potential as a factor in the developmental process. Moreover, these two programs offer contrasting applications of the community action technique.

Under the able leadership of Dr. Ravel, Venezuela has pursued the "coordination" approach, utilizing the services of existing agencies by training their personnel to employ community action concepts in promoting development. Dr. Pizano has implemented a program through the agency of village-level community action workers. Interestingly, as the two programs have developed they have evolved by incorporating certain of the basic organizational techniques of each plan. Indeed, among the more interesting developments in the use of community action is underway today in Colombia.

There under the leadership of President Lleras, the massive involvement of all the many entities, both public and private, active in the social welfare field is evolving. Integración Popular, as the program is named, under the direction of Emilio Urrea, as special assistant to the President is experimenting with solutions for the problems of poverty. One of the more interesting facets of the program is the utilization of organizations such as Rockefeller-supported Fepronal, largely an organization of businessmen, and the Colombian Institute of Social Development, a lay organization of the Catholic Church, as prime contractors responsible for comprehensive developmental programs, both social and economic in relatively large geographic areas.

The Bolivarian meeting also will evaluate the performance of the Bolivian program, which was instituted under the influence of USAID, and the Peruvian program which has received about one-third of its financial support from a U.S. loan, as well as a \$20 million loan from the Inter-American Bank—see page 22297.

In response to a request from the new Bolivian Government in 1964, USAID undertook a study of the problem of rural development. In essence this was a replacement for a U.N. program which had produced only negligible results through the use of rural training centers designed to provide vocational training for the Indians who live on the Andean Plain.

David Anderson, an AID specialist in community development, with long experience in the Middle East, devised a comprehensive program based on the village-level worker concept. Under his direction, the implementation of the program began in December 1964. One unique aspect of the program brings the training school to the locality in that programmed administrative centers are utilized as training centers for the 5-month course which is provided for the village workers. The students are drawn from the individual communities where they will live and work following graduation. By March of 1965, Anderson had de-

veloped a 2,000-page curriculum in Spanish for the course and the first group entered training. By the time Anderson was rotated in the normal course of AID procedures in July 1966, 197 village workers had been trained and assigned, to service 1,418 communities representing about 30 percent of the rural population. Ten area operations offices were functioning, through which 321 local projects were underway or completed, in which the local residents were contributing more than 75 percent of the cost. As of January 1, 1966, the program was transferred to Bolivian National control.

By April of this year—the most recent data available—an additional seven area operations offices were established; 58 more village workers were trained and assigned; 95 additional workers were in training; 430 new communities were covered by the program representing an additional 10 percent of the rural population; and 572 more projects had been approved. In addition to these accomplishments, a loan of \$1.1 million was obtained from the Inter-American Bank, to support a loan program to the communities which was substituted for the direct grants used prior to that time. Of the project applications, 28 percent were for schools and more than 50 percent were related to upgrading of agriculture.

Significantly, the program functioned without a U.S. advisor until late summer of this year.

Within the context of attitudes manifest in floor action on the Foreign Assistance Act both here and in the other body, and this brief discussion of the four major programs to be evaluated in Bogotá, I believe the results of the Conference are of particular significance to the United States.

The record of our support of community action programs is at best spotty. The evidence is persuasive that U.S. officials for the most part fail to grasp the value of community action as underpinning for the total program effort in structuring economic development. Thus it has been implemented only sparingly, and under special case circumstances. In all cases with which I am familiar, such programs have been undertaken in response to the insistent demands of a national leader as is true in the Philippines, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Peru, or in the desperate search for solutions which is inspired by revolutionary crisis, as is true in Bolivia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam.

A measure of indifference to the value of community action within the AID hierarchy is the paucity of information in point at both the Washington and mission levels. For this reason, the data I have accumulated on community action programs comes from a variety of sources, largely outside of official channels, and so is subject to the caveat, that although it is the best I can obtain, it is probably faulty in detail.

A second measure of this indifference is reflected in the financial support extended by AID. For example, out of more than \$6.5 billion committed during the life of the Alliance for Progress, no more than \$30 million, and probably less, has



been allocated to community action programs. Moreover such breakdowns are simply not available at AID/Washington, and can only be obtained by careful analysis of the individual country assistance programs. Yet in this same period, these five countries which are represented in the Bogotá meeting have spent at least twice that amount, excluding local community contributions of labor materials, money, and services, on community action programs.

In fiscal year 1968, AID has programmed about \$8.6 million in support of the concept, yet Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela alone will spend about \$35 million of their own funds through their community action programs.

The level of interest in the concept in Colombia is indicated by the simple fact that Colombia is paying the expenses of the participants in the November Conference. Similarly the commitment of such relatively large sums in support of community action as noted above reflects the alliance of foreign leaders to the community action concept. Similarly, the late President Magsaysay of the Philippines confronted with the Huk insurgency committed major resources including over 10,000 college graduates to a village-level community action program as the backbone of his campaign to "win the hearts and minds" of his people.

The quantitative proof of the value of community action is notable for its absence, which again reflects the unwillingness of our Government to commit resources to its evaluation. Nonetheless, the raw evidence is persuasive, and what little research there is supports the conclusion.

Pakistan was stagnating until it instituted its rural public works program based on community action. Today, 6 years later, it is the showcase offered by AID as proof that foreign assistance works. Moreover in an analysis of the startling change in the rate of development in Pakistan developed by Walter Falcon and Carl Gotsch of the Harvard University advisory project for the planning commission of that country, they attribute 75 percent of the currently high growth rates of that nation's agricultural sector to the community action works program.

The simple truth is that community action where it has been utilized appears to work. The more sophisticated analysts of the concept insist on measuring its value in highly esoteric terms of political and community development, which are undoubtedly products of its application. For our purposes, however, I believe it is best viewed as a medium of capital formation in developing nations.

It would seem axiomatic that the key to economic progress lies in the spirit and labor of a nation's people. Among the most notable illustrations in point is the evolution of Japan, a country renowned for its lack of natural wealth, whose people are praised for industry and genius. Community action techniques lend themselves to the mobilization of precisely these qualities which if not latent in a people, necessarily preclude the possibility of economic progress.

Most importantly, these techniques are most productive in providing the social infrastructure necessary to rural modernization. Obviously, if the people themselves can build the schools, dams, roads, and irrigation canals so vital to agricultural progress, the central government can apply the funds so saved to some meaningful capital requirement for national development. It is for this reason that community action should be regarded as a form of capital formation.

The Latin experience has been largely in public works. The results are impressive. Well over 5,000 classrooms, quite possibly as many as 10,000 have been built. Literally thousands of kilometers of access and feeder roads have opened isolated villages to the urban markets. Many miles of irrigation canals serving vast numbers of previously parched acres have produced land which grows badly needed food crops. Health stations have been built. Water, safe to drink, has been supplied to large numbers of the rural population. Environmental sanitation facilities have helped reduce the spread of debilitating disease.

In short the Latin experience demonstrates unmistakably that community action is a path to modernization of rural life. The principal products of these people-oriented programs are the essential ingredients of advance in agriculture, education, and health.

It would appear to take little imagination to visualize the application of this experience to human development under the Alliance.

In Colombia, schools have been consistently completed through Accion Comunal for about \$1,300 including an apartment for the teacher. This is roughly one-third the cost of conventional construction.

In Panama, rural housing has been successfully built through the self-help program for \$300 a house.

In Peru, all-weather mountain access roads, built at a cost of about \$750 per kilometer, one-tenth of the usual price, are in use at this moment.

Community action techniques utilized in various areas of Latin America demonstrate beyond question that the concept can be employed in comprehensive rural development programs.

Improvement of agricultural productivity was dramatically demonstrated in El Salvador, where the increment in income represented \$375 for each dollar invested by public sources.

Nationwide community action programs lend themselves to utilization as improvised agricultural extension services. The levels of current practice are rudimentary, thus the level of sophistication of extension work permits the use of alert rural residents with the equivalent of a high school education, often less.

Experience indicates the cost of administration is low. In Colombia, for example, a field level employee can be maintained for less than \$600 a year.

Each of the major programs was structured to serve modernization of agriculture, although lack of funds has discouraged intensive use for improvement of farm practices. With additional resources it is generally believed that this

can be a contribution of major importance. In evaluating any effort to improve life in rural areas, it is important to remember that progress by Latin standards differs from ours. Perhaps as many as 80 percent of farm units remain today at the handtool level. The simple introduction of the animal drawn plow offers potential for major advance in farm income.

A recent AID loan to the community development program in the Dominican Republic earmarks \$1.4 million for agricultural development. An evaluation of the program made by a specialist for AID in February reflects that efforts in this field have been on the pilot program level, yet the specialist is encouraged by the response.

A major test of this phase of community action is just getting under way in Peru where the Inter-American Development Bank is financing over half of a \$39.5 million 3-year plan. Just under a third of these funds will be directed into extension and supervised credit. Significantly both of these loans have been subjected to careful analysis in terms of potential to create income-producing improvements. Both rely heavily on the agricultural inputs to produce additional revenue to both the people and the government through taxation.

In both Pakistan, as noted earlier, and in Taiwan comprehensive community action programs have apparently been responsible for dramatic improvements in the growth of the agricultural sector.

With this pattern of experience in mind, community action programs would seem extremely attractive vehicles for accomplishing the new goals the President called for in his message on foreign assistance. There he proposed that "the act establish agriculture, health and education as our primary concerns" for these as he said are "the fundamentals of a decent life." Indeed, that message alludes to the success of the program in Taiwan as proof that "men—acting together—have the power to shape their destiny."

Yet the community action concept is highlighted only by omission from the long list of suggested priorities.

At the time leading figures in the administration were discussing the summit resolution with Members of the Congress, I raised this precise question. In fact small changes were made in the wording of the resolution in an effort to give greater prominence to the concept. Once again U.S. officials reiterated their belief in the community development approach. Pressed for explanations of the failure to give greater emphasis to community action programs, they cited shortages of expert personnel and the political sensitivity of community action as major limitations.

While both are no doubt problems, I find them wanting as justifications.

There is a wealth of experience among Latins. At this moment there are nearly 1,500 of them working full time as employees of the programs I have mentioned. Clearly there are many more available in the many isolated programs which are active throughout the hemisphere. There are at least 15,000 rural

communities in these same countries with organized local community action councils. Well over 20,000 individual projects have been completed in these countries during the life of the Alliance.

Among our people, there are many former Peace Corps volunteers with major experience in community action. The United Nations has managed to find a number of Americans who are experts in the field. There are also many private organizations staffed by personnel with a depth of experience.

The problem of political sensitivity seems a different sort of animal. It is my impression that this term is used most often as an excuse for inaction for which there is no other admissible reason. We have time and again demonstrated our willingness to use the AID program for political purposes, and the essentially political goals of the Alliance are unmistakably set out in the Charter of Punta del Este. Indeed the probable political ramifications of community action could not be more eloquently described than they are in the second and fourth paragraphs of that charter.

I think the best explanation can be found in the economic ideology of AID mission directors. Dedicated to a sophisticated concept of forced industrialization as the only satisfactory means to accomplish economic development, they simply cannot see the importance of the bootstrap approach. In discussions with U.S. personnel from all levels of AID, I find that those at the highest and lowest levels are convinced that community development can be a valuable tool. In contrast the intermediate levels, directing country programs from capital cities, demonstrate little understanding and less interest in the concept. I feel they have forgotten both their mission and their history.

Community action is as American as the hotdog. It played a major role in our development. Its widespread use astonished de Tocqueville, who in his own words admired:

The extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object to the exertions of a great many men, and inducing them voluntarily to pursue it.

It is a simple process, probably intrinsic in the earliest social organization of man. It is no more than an ad hoc action in which men discover that they can best serve their mutual benefit acting in concert. From such beginnings great governments grow.

There are, too, more immediate advantages. In Vietnam it has been found that village facilities built by the hands of the villagers are free from terrorist destruction, simply because the Vietcong know they will alienate those whose work they destroy.

Universally it has been found that maintenance of facilities built by the local inhabitants is no problem because those with a vested interest in a project both respect it and keep it in good repair.

Facilities built with local contributed labor are invariably those which the community wants, and so are used.

Participation by those who have nothing to give but their labor leads to con-

tribution of materials and money by the more affluent.

Involvement of the people gives them a sense of participation, and provides demonstrable evidence that somebody in the distant capital really cares.

These are among the lessons of the Latin Experience. The programs have proven workable and highly valuable instruments for integrating large numbers of widespread isolated communities into the national mainstream, thus inviting political stability.

In my judgment the evidence is clear that community action is a valuable developmental tool. Intensive study of the techniques of proven utility should be undertaken immediately. Understandably AID, confronted with the necessity of careful conservation of its funds, may have overlooked the concept. However, it is very clear that we must make every possible effort to develop possible areas in which the tax dollar can be more effectively used. Accordingly, I would urge the appropriate committees to undertake a detailed study of the best manner in which community action can be used in furthering the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In this effort the reports of the Bogotá Conference appear an excellent point of beginning. Hopefully, AID officials have already made arrangements to obtain copies of these proceedings which can be used for this purpose.

Community action is not a panacea, for there are no panaceas. Nonetheless, it deserves first rank among the priorities of implementation in the foreign assistance program. It is not the easiest solution. It involves headaches of administrative organization. There is a shortage of personnel, though not so great as the apologists would claim. It is also true that certain political risks develop. But the development of the emerging nations is not a comfortable home for the "nervous Nellies" of the world.

Our national heritage is eloquent testimony that man's legitimate aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men working within the framework of democratic institutions. I have no fear of the results. The ultimate test of our sincere dedication to this national heritage is our willingness to trust the future to the will of free men. If we fear this end, we have lost our faith.

#### BATTLING COMMUNISM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 50th anniversary date of the Soviet revolution, it behooves Americans to take a close look at the balance sheet compiled by our No. 1 enemy. We should not ignore the "gains" which communism has made in building a war machine and in extending its brand of influence,

but by the same token, we should not forget the fact that these "gains" have been made at the expense of others, often-times the Russian people themselves.

In this context, it pleased me to note a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital on "Battling Communism," which outlines the proper way for Americans to observe November 7. I commend the Citizens for Freedom for promoting this idea, and I trust that November 7 will be a day of mourning in a majority of the communities of this land.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place this editorial in the RECORD for my colleagues to read. The editorial follows:

#### BATTLING COMMUNISM

Americans who hate communism have something constructive they can do about it. They can observe Nov. 7 as a day of mourning for the victims of communism, as suggested by a group of patriotic citizens, and dedicate the week in which the day falls to countering Communist propaganda.

The day of mourning was set on the date the Soviets have organized world-wide celebrations to mark the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia.

Observance of the mourning, says the Citizens for Freedom which proclaimed the date, can help spread the truth about communism.

"During the last half century, communism has been responsible for the extermination of at least 85 million people through civil war, man-made famine, purges, genocidal deportations and executions, in torture chambers and in concentration camps," the proclamation says truthfully.

"Communism has systematically destroyed moral and spiritual values; imposed incalculable sufferings on nations and people; has persecuted all religions and placed myriad minds in the chains of thought control."

"Communism set the pattern for Fascism, Nazism and other varieties of totalitarianism, and its relentless drive for world domination has kept nearly 100 million people of East-Central Europe in bondage and the world in a state of turmoil."

"Since 1917 not one of the nations conquered by force or seized by subterfuge has been permitted a free election, nor has any free people ever voted to adopt communism in preference to democracy."

"During these 50 years, Communist dictatorships have preached 'liberation' while practicing unlimited oppression to consolidate their rule based on terror."

To combat communism, every American community can rededicate itself to restoring freedom to those oppressed by the Communists.

This is doing something constructive to counteract the destructive force represented by the hammer and sickle.

#### RICE COUNCIL ADVERTISING

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am of the very strong opinion that the current advertising campaign of the Rice Council for Marketing Development, which seeks to promote the sale of rice by belittling potatoes, should be investigated by the Federal Trade Commission,



and I have written to the FTC requesting that this be done.

The campaign should also be investigated by responsible elements of the national advertising media who strongly advocate the right to police themselves—a right that could be lost if irresponsibility creates a demand for Federal control of advertising.

If the current advertising campaign of the Rice Council is not actually illegal, it certainly is in exceedingly poor taste in that it attempts to build one product by tearing down another.

Consider the July ad in Life magazine which shows what must be a cull potato with a caption under it: "Ugh." The message continues:

Just think. You never have to peel rice. All you need to make rice is hot water. Hot diggity! Bury it in butter. Or add gobs of gravy! Rice fills you the long way... Not the round way. Come on now—swear off mashing, beating, peeling, whipping. Rice is the reckless one!

I think, perhaps, that the "reckless one" is the Rice Council's advertising copywriter.

The unpeeled potato may not be the most beautiful object in the world, but it compares very favorably with a handfull of rough rice. Forgetting esthetics, it seems to me that the thrust of the Rice Council's advertising is that rice makes you slim and potatoes make you fat. The council's September advertising asks, in boxcar type:

Did you ever see a fat Chinese?

This over a picture of a porterhouse steak with a pile of butter-laden rice alongside. Although an obese Chinese may be a rarity in food-short Red China today, in happier times this was not true. No one ever confused Charlie Chan with the "Thin Man."

If the Rice Council's advertising copywriter believes that "gobs of gravy" on rice is less fattening than on potatoes, let him consult his calorie counter—or better yet, his family physician. The U.S. Department of Agriculture publication "Nutritive Value of Foods," reports that a baked potato weighing 99 grams contains 90 calories, while a cup of cooked rice weighing 168 grams has 185 calories. In other words, there is a little less than 1 calorie per gram in potatoes and a little more than 1 in rice. The report also says that both potatoes and rice contain only a "trace" of fat.

Obviously, the calorie count in butter or "gobs of gravy" remains constant, whether used on potatoes or rice.

Thus, the Rice Council's advertising campaign is not only unfair to the potato industry, but is both deceptive and misleading to the consumer.

In reply to protests over the campaign, the Rice Council has said, in part:

The industry's intent is to call attention to rice in a light, humorous manner in a campaign not unlike the widely-recognized Avis-Hertz efforts.

This is a very poor parallel. It would not really be very humorous if Avis advertised that Hertz vehicles were unsafe, which is approximately what the Rice Council seems to be saying about potatoes to a cholesterol-conscious, diet-minded public.

The potato industry is a highly important segment of American agriculture. Potatoes are a major cash crop for a great number of Idaho farmers. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the average price received by farmers for potatoes on September 15, 1967, was \$1.90 per hundredweight, as compared with \$2.07 a year earlier. This represents only 67 percent of parity, or two-thirds of what is considered a fair price.

With this depressed price, about the last thing potato growers need is a national advertising campaign designed to scare consumers away from this delicious and nutritious food.

One of the proposed ads states, in part:

The Idaho has got to go.

It is my understanding that magazine publication of the ad has been stopped. But it is also my understanding that the Rice Council has been distributing a folder which plays on the same sentence. And, inasmuch as the word "Idaho" is copyrighted for our potatoes, does not this make the Rice Council subject to legal—and possibly punitive—action?

Certainly, those who control the copyright provisions of the word "Idaho" as it pertains to potatoes should study any possible infringement of their rights.

I have also written to the Department of Agriculture asking whether, directly or indirectly, Federal funds are paying for part of this campaign.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation's report of its operations for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1967, total commitments to the rice program, including inventory losses, export subsidies and sales under Public Law 480, were \$175,862,724. Since there are only about 10,000 commercial rice growers in the United States, this means an outlay of about \$17,500 per operator in a single year.

I doubt that the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, would directly subsidize an advertising program such as the one being conducted by the Rice Council. However, in view of the fact that the rice industry is so heavily subsidized, can it not be assumed that some of this Government assistance is being used by the Rice Council for this campaign?—particularly in view of the fact that the money probably would not have been in the hands of the rice growers had it not been for Government subsidies.

This matter demands investigation by the responsible Federal agencies and departments. Should it be concluded that the advertising campaign is false, or based on a false premise or premises, it should be immediately terminated. And, should it be developed that Federal money is, indeed, either directly or indirectly involved, steps should be taken for its return to the Federal Treasury.

#### APPLICANTS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS WILL RECEIVE ADMISSION TEST SCORES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned with our Nation's shortage of physicians, nurses, and other health personnel, I have been deeply disturbed by many of the policies and trends in medical education.

One area which has been particularly distressing is the medical school student admissions system which has been established by the medical schools, the AMA, and the Association of American Medical Colleges. Perhaps the single, most important factor in deciding whether a college graduate will be admitted to medical school is his performance on the medical college admissions test. However, the policy of the AAMC and the Psychological Corp., which formulate and administer the test, has been to withhold test results from both the student and his undergraduate school. Thus, individual scores on this critical examination have been available only to medical schools.

The aura of secrecy surrounding medical admissions test results has had may adverse effects: Undergraduate colleges or universities are at a loss to evaluate the adequacy of their premedical educational policies and curriculum; guidance departments and premedical advisers have been unable to formulate and review their counseling efforts; students who were denied admission faced uncertainty if they sought remedial or supplementary education to prepare themselves for a second attempt.

However, I am pleased to inform the House that this policy has been recently reevaluated. According to information supplied me by the executive director of the American Association of Medical Colleges, beginning with the test which will be administered in 1968, scores will be transmitted to each student and to the college which he attended.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend both the AAMC and the Psychological Corp. for this important decision. I share the hope of those who have instituted this action that it will reduce medical student attrition rates, improve the system of premedical education, and result in a fairer testing procedure.

However, it should be realized that the release of test scores is but one aspect of the medical school admissions system. In view of the increasing shortage of physicians, I urge that organized medicine, the academic community and the Congress continue to reexamine the structure of medical education in the United States.

#### SECTION 406 OF TITLE IV OF THE POVERTY BILL

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, just last week I received a telegram from C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, calling my attention to section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill. Until I read that telegram, I had not realized that this section was a cleverly concealed attempt to transfer to the Department of Commerce some of the more vital functions now being carried out by the Small Business Administration.

If I recall correctly, there have been several efforts, during recent years, to have the Small Business Administration transferred to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce. On each occasion, these efforts have failed. Now, it would seem that failing to carry out this feat openly, a back-door attempt is being made to do the same thing.

Section 4A of the Small Business Act states specifically that SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

It is obvious that it is the intent of Congress that SBA be an independent spokesman for the small business community. If I am correct in my reasoning here, it then follows that SBA functions as well, are not to be subordinated to any other Federal agency.

I hope the House will reject this section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill when it gets to the floor. We should not support this attempt to merge and submerge SBA functions into the Department of Commerce.

#### ISRAEL-ARAB SITUATION

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the attitude of the United States with regard to the increasingly serious Israel-Arab situation. An Israel warship has been the victim of unprovoked attack by Russian-supplied radar-controlled missiles. It is the first time in history that this type of radar missile has been used to sink a ship of any flag.

It is highly significant that the attack occurred at the same time that Soviet Deputy Defense Minister Zakharov arrived in Cairo—with a large military delegation from Moscow—to add to the estimated 8,000 Soviet military advisers and technicians already in Egypt. It proves that the two troublemakers, Russia, worldwide, and Egypt, in the Middle East, are hand in glove in their determination to start war again between Israel and the Arab nations.

It greatly disturbs me, in fact, it is inconceivable that the Johnson administration, with evidence of Arab-Soviet ties

of the strongest kind, is reneging on its commitment to Israel.

This country promised to sell a limited number of military jets to Israel, a commitment it has not yet honored.

It seems to me that it is essential for the United States to live up to this commitment to Israel. By withholding this sale of jets to Israel, at a time when Russia is pouring military weapons into the Arab nations, we are encouraging further Communist Russia intervention into the Middle East. This country should sell to Israel the weapons she needs for her defense, a sale which we promised a long time ago.

#### ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks we have seen a startling example of confused thinking within the Justice Department in the application of our antitrust laws. Rockwell-Standard Corp. of Bethany, Okla., was required by the Department, as a condition to approval of its merger with North American Aviation, to divest itself of the manufacturing rights to the Jet Commander Model 1121 business-type aircraft. The rationale behind the demand was that the Aero-Commander jet and North American's highly successful business jet aircraft would otherwise dominate or monopolize the market for such planes.

In the first place the facts simply do not bear this out. The two planes offer far different service characteristics to the prospective buyer and one costs nearly twice as much as the other. Foreign manufacturers also already have a dominant share of this market.

Under pressure of the Justice Department and its doctrinaire antitrust philosophy, Rockwell-Standard sold its rights to the plane to the Israel Government for \$25 million, after futilely attempting to change the Department's position. We therefore have the almost ludicrous situation of the U.S. Government, in the name of "protecting" the American consumer market, engineering the surrender of one of the best U.S.-built jets to a foreign nation, and in the process destroying one of our important manufacturing resources for a type of highly sophisticated machinery which our security requires. Also vitally affected are the several hundred people in the Oklahoma plant whose livelihood has been threatened by this whim of the Justice Department.

This matter was brought to my attention by Mr. Atherton Bean, chairman of the board of International Milling Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., whose corporation owns and uses the Jet Commander. They have been advised that by this transfer of manufacturing rights to a foreign nation they can expect the value

of their aircraft to decrease by as much as 50 percent.

Of course, future servicing, parts, modifications, and so forth, must be affected by virtue of the fact they now own a plane whose manufacturer is situated in an area of continuous political tension and turmoil. Mr. Bean well makes the point in a letter of protest to the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department that they may have "protected" International Milling Co. and other aircraft owners into not only a substantial loss on resale value of the aircraft but also into possible future disastrous accidents through possible decreased competency and availability of the new foreign manufacturers.

Such whimsical application of the antitrust laws is incredible to me, and while the entire episode appears to be closed, the facts certainly need to set out in the cold light of day to the end that this sort of action is not repeated. I insert Mr. Bean's letter to Mr. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, protesting this matter in the RECORD at this point:

#### INTERNATIONAL MILLING,

Minneapolis, Minn., October 4, 1967.

Mr. DONALD F. TURNER,  
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division,  
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TURNER: Various Minnesota Senators and Congressmen to whom I sent a copy of my letter of August 30, 1967, protesting what seemed to us the unnecessary action of your Department in requiring Rockwell-Standard to divest itself of the Jet Commander business before it would be allowed to merge with North American Aviation, have sent me copies of your letter of September 18th in which you describe the now well-publicized fact that Rockwell-Standard did get rid of the business to Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd. In addition I thank you for your direct reply to me of September 13th over the subscript of Mr. Lewis Bernstein.

What I say hereafter will be with full knowledge that further protest is futile. The deal is consummated. Various damages inflicted upon (a) those of us who own the previously purchased Jet Commanders, (b) the community of Bethany, Oklahoma, (c) the future competitive situation in business jets are done. Yet I choose to make a point or two.

How curious, how impersonally abstract, how unrelated to any point made in my letter is the sentence which reads: "Investigation of the capability and projected plans of the purchaser indicated no basis for concluding that the sale would probably substantially weaken competition in the sales of business jets in this country." I wasn't worrying over a changed competitive situation. I was making the point that your action undermines the confidence of the present owner and the future possible purchaser of a Jet Commander now in service for its safety and modification for its continuous modernization. You simply comment that the "purchaser appears (italic is mine) to be an established and competent aircraft manufacturer . . ." Do your people seriously believe that Israel Aircraft is the technical equal for our purposes of Rockwell-Standard? Do they really think that a manufacturer situated in an area of continuous political tension and turmoil is as good a source of servicing and parts, etc. as an American manufacturer in Bethany, Oklahoma, or Southern California—as dependable a source of continuous modification technology? Jet planes are not automobiles and the people who buy them, though they may already be



dealing with Butler Aviation and have a degree of confidence in their operation, still know that the source of parts and modification technology is in the future by your action to be a company new to an exotic area of the aircraft business, distant in geography and politically and militarily exposed.

I suggest that this is a clear case of doctrinaire antitrust philosophy applied with either cynical or playful disregard of the interests of a whole group of American executives and American companies and of the American economy. The allegation is made that this was done in order to protect us. Now the people who buy jet planes at net prices from \$600,000 to \$2 or \$3 million are not children in the economic wilderness. If there is any group in the U.S. economy which should not have government time and money expended for its "protection," this is surely it.

We strongly suspect that you have "protected" us into a substantial loss on the resale value of our plane. You may have "protected" us into a future disastrous accident. There is a line in Oscar Hammerstein's libretto for "The King and I" that fits our situation perfectly: "If allies are strong with power to protect me, might they not protect me out of all I own?"

Your advisers have gone completely off balance on this one. There is, of course, nothing that we can do about it now because your desires have been met and our interests sacrificed to their philosophy. But I trust that the hazard and damage of this curious pedantry will not be lost on you as other similar cases come to the fore for decision and action. This displayed thoroughly bad judgment.

Yours very truly,

ATHERTON BEAN,  
Chairman of the Board.

#### GIVE LIGHT AND THE DAILY NEWS WILL STILL BE LOST

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has editorially indicated that they, too, will continue to call the Commissioner of the District, "mayor," and will disregard both fact and law.

They plead guilty, at least in part, to the charges of the "Ashb'k swivet" directed against both the political ploy of the President and the propagation of it by the news media.

I assume that if such lofty pillars of journalism as the News and the Star can call things what they are not—the Evening Star scooped the News to the same conclusion by several days—then why do not we all. Thus, for those wishing to join in, let me suggest that for openers, these remarks will be appended by the editorial clipped from the Washington Daily "magazine." Why not?

I am sure it will not disturb several of the radio stations if we change their names and henceforth identify them as television stations, or in reverse, identify TV stations, and their personalities, as radio stations and radio personnel.

Then, of course, there will be radio

when what we really mean is TV, and magazines when actually they are newspapers when they are in truth magazines, and on and on, ad nauseam.

Of course, it is a bit ridiculous, but "radio" is easier to write in a headline than "television" or "magazine" and "newspapers" might get left out altogether since they have the longest count of all.

If one looks hard enough, one notices that the motto of the Washington Daily "magazine" reads: "Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."

Let us hope so. In the controversy over mayor versus Commissioner, the News is not helping much. Their motto should read: "Give Light and the Daily News Will Still Be Lost."

The editorial follows:

MAYOR IT IS

When is a mayor not a mayor? When the law says he's a commissioner.

That's not a line from a Gilbert & Sullivan ditty, but a simple deduction by which Congressman John M. Ashbrook seems to have worked himself into quite a swivet.

The legislation which set up the District's new government, the Ohio Republican reminds us, designates our chief magistrate as a commissioner, not a mayor. Mr. Ashbrook suggests that persistent use of the title of mayor may be a piece of political skulduggery by "members of the Johnson Administration, especially the President." Moreover, he says, the White House has used newspapers as a patsy in this little ploy; they don't even use quote marks around "mayor." (There, we did.)

The members of the Johnson Administration, "especially the President," will have to fend for themselves. As for the newspapers—well, this newspaper, anyway—we're inclined to plead guilty, at least in part.

No headline writer in his right mind is going to refer to a public official as commissioner when he can get away with mayor. Without quotes. Commissioner in a one-column headline? Forget it, Cong. Ashb'k.

#### DARTMOUTH STAGES A PARTY FOR THE ENEMY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last weekend Dartmouth College held a symposium on the theme, "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergencies." The purpose of the undertaking was to consider the achievements of the Soviet Union from 1917 to date. It is to be hoped that during the weekend a period of mourning was observed for the literally millions of human beings who perished through Communist aggression in the last 50 years. It is to be hoped that the responsibilities of intellectual honesty served to temper academic freedom in recognizing the tremendous loss to mankind inflicted by the Communist movement on familial and religious life, labor and—oh, yes—academic freedom. It is to be hoped that discussion of Soviet technological advances included

Soviet missile sites and Mig planes and their possible use against Dartmouth alumni in Vietnam.

No one in his right mind would celebrate the anniversaries of Dachau and Buchenwald with film festivals and concerts. Rather, these are times for mourning.

The Manchester Union Leader of October 19, 1967, carried a guest editorial by my good friend, Mel Thompson, of Orford, on the Dartmouth symposium. Like many other patriotic Americans, Mel simply cannot forget the American lives lost in Korea or Vietnam through Soviet aid. Nor can he dismiss the Soviet's avowed purpose of domination of the free world.

I include the editorial, "A Party for the Enemy," by Meldrim Thompson of Orford, from the Manchester Union Leader and the account of the Dartmouth observation from the Valley News of October 16, 1967, in the Record at this point. [From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 19, 1967]

#### A PARTY FOR THE ENEMY

Guest editorial by Meldrim Thompson of Orford.

The measure of how far we have drifted as a nation on the sea of imbecility will be drawn this weekend on the Dartmouth College campus.

A grand party is being planned to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of an enemy who has sworn "to bury" Americans, presumably beneath the debris of a nuclear holocaust.

During this "Russian Weekend," there will be dinners, discussion panels, concerts, art exhibits and a film festival, all draped around a symposium theme "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergencies." The symposium, to be attended by many visiting professors, will consider Soviet achievements from 1917 to date.

Surely, no honest American can doubt the fact that Russia is our sworn enemy. The Record is long, tragic and clear. Russian guns and equipment snuffing out American lives in Korea; Russian rockets implanted in Cuba and aimed at our heartland; and Russian matériel accounting for a large percentage of the 100,000 American casualties in Vietnam.

What manner of madness afflicts us that, while our soldiers perish daily in distant rice paddies from Russian mortar fire, a leading American college celebrates the anniversary of an absolute tyranny determined to destroy our culture?

A "Russian Weekend" that carefully analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of our adversary, or compared and extolled the virtues of our American civilization with the retrogressive Russian revolution, would be a real contribution to the public that has been invited to attend the observances. But an observance that affords a certain breed of intellectuals an opportunity to sing hosannas for their form of Paradise Regained will be another lost weekend on the calendar of American patriotism.

If the colleges and universities, now so heavily supported by our tax dollars, would invest a tiny fraction of their time celebrating, observing and fostering the concept of human liberty and dignity under our constitutional form of government, this nation would be a far safer home of the free than it is today.

Instead of a party for the enemy here at the cradle of American freedom, Dartmouth College might better guide its students and the visiting public along the constitutional highroad of individual liberty.



[From the Valley News, Oct. 16, 1967]  
**RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY WILL BE  
 OBSERVED AT DARTMOUTH**

**HANOVER.**—The fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution will be observed at Dartmouth College by a Russian Weekend Oct. 19-21 (Thursday through Sunday).

A symposium, "The Soviet Union and the West—Evolving Contrasts and Convergences" will be attended by many distinguished visiting professors.

The Hopkins Center will contribute its full facilities for the arts to exhibitions of Russian art, cinema, theater, and music. All events will be open to the public.

The symposium, sponsored by the Russian department at Dartmouth with the assistance of the Student Council for International and Comparative Studies, will consider the Soviet achievement since 1917. Participants include professors from Harvard, Columbia, MIT, Swarthmore, NYU, Cornell and Dartmouth.

Thursday afternoon the theme of Soviet achievement will be highlighted by J. P. Nettl, visiting professor at NYU, in his keynote address. At other panels during the weekend Joseph Berliner, of Brandeis, and George Fisher, of Columbia, will discuss Soviet Economy and Society. George Gibian, of Cornell, and Thompson Bradley, of Swarthmore, will concern themselves with the artist in a revolutionary society. At the conference dinner, open only by invitation, Henry Roberts, of Dartmouth will speak on the Historicity of the Russian Revolution. Soviet politics and History will be the subject of a discussion Saturday morning by Uri Ra'an, of MIT, and Robert V. Daniels, of the University of Vermont.

Concurrent with the symposium, The Dartmouth Players will present "Uncle Vanya," by Anton Chekov in the Studio Theater of Hopkins Center each evening at 8:30 p.m.

The Yale Russian Chorus will give a concert in Spaulding Auditorium at 8:30 p.m. Friday. This choral group, formed in 1954 by a small group interested in Russian culture, has gained world-wide popularity from its frequent tours abroad. Their program of Russian music will include folk songs, brigand ballads, and Cossack tunes.

A Russian film festival has been in progress for two weeks sponsored by the Dartmouth Film Society. Performances of "Ivan the Terrible" and "The End of St. Petersburg" were greeted with much enthusiasm. For the Russian Weekend the Film Society will present "Ballad of Love" and "There Was an Old Couple" at 8:30 p.m. Thursday in Spaulding Auditorium.

An exhibit in the Jaffe-Friede Gallery—"Dada, Surrealism and Today"—will be open daily. Other art and poster exhibits will be displayed in the Lower Jewett Corridor of Hopkins Center and the Main Lobby of Baker Library.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

**Mr. PETTIS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

**Mr. DENNEY.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on congressional redistricting as currently constituted. As my colleagues know, the bill merely prohibits at-large elections of Representatives—except Hawaii and New Mexico—and provides that no State shall be required to redistrict before 1970 unless it has available the results of a spe-

cial Federal census. When we voted on H.R. 2508 in June, I was forced to vote against it.

My quarrel with the bill was not that it provided a statutory standard of permissible deviation but instead that it was unconstitutionally broad for the interim elections of 1968 and 1970. As my colleagues will recall, the bill allowed a 30-percent deviation among congressional districts in a particular State. It was my opinion at that time if congressional intent said only up to 10-percent deviation would be allowed in 1972 and thereafter, then in keeping with that one-man, one-vote concept, only a 10-percent deviation should have been allowed in 1968 and 1970.

**Mr. Speaker,** I agree with my distinguished colleagues on the Judiciary Conference Committee that redistricting should be done on up-to-date figures. It would be inequitable and a futile act to redistrict a State based on census data 7 or 8 years old.

But my specific opposition to the bill in its present form is this:

Congress is again abrogating its constitutional responsibility. In a number of its opinions, the Supreme Court in this area has stated, "in absence of an expression of congressional intent" then they go on to hold that a certain percentage would be acceptable to them. Likewise, when we pass laws, most of the time specifics of how the law is to be implemented are left up to the executive branch by the phrase, "and the Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this act." As is too often the case, at some later date, we then become upset because the Court does not interpret or the Secretary does not run the programs in the way we intended.

This is an area of clear-cut congressional responsibility which I feel requires immediate and definite action. In order to carry out our constitutional responsibilities, we must enact definite statutory standards for congressional districts. As the only completely popularly elected branch of the three, it is our job. Granted, it is not an easy task; it is not a pleasant task. But it is a job that should not and cannot be delayed.

**Mr. Speaker,** it is my understanding that several members of the committee intend to offer separate bills on the floor that will provide for a specific expression of congressional intent and a permanent solution to the problem. It would be my hope that my colleagues join with me in giving these bills careful consideration and then pass a bill which will fairly and equitably implement the one-man one-vote principle.

#### A BETTER LIFE FOR OUR CITIZENS HERE AT HOME

**Mr. PETTIS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

**Mr. BUTTON.** Mr. Speaker, it had

been my hope that many of my colleagues would have reconsidered their previous vote amputating the model cities and rent supplements funds and now thought through the alternatives to it.

The Senate had given Members of this House a chance to do just that.

Decent housing for low-income families is an urgent need in nearly every city in the Nation. If business cannot fill that need, then it logically follows that Government will do so, sooner or later.

The fact is that the business community—builders, bankers, and brokers—support the rent supplement program. So do mayors, city managers, labor, churches, and other organizations. The program has this wide-based support because it represents a working partnership between government and private enterprise. The features of the program are:

It is available for new or rehabilitated housing, privately financed, and privately managed. The property stays on the local tax rolls.

Only the really poor are eligible. Income limits are the same as for public housing, but tenants are not required to move if income rises. The supplement is simply reduced or eliminated, therefore not discouraging self-improvement.

It tends to reduce Government control over housing construction and management.

It stimulates private investment. To date, \$500 million in private financing has been triggered by the \$32 million of Federal funds approved for rent supplement payments. Recently, the life insurance industry committed \$1 billion to attack the problem of urban slums, most of which will be used in the rent supplement program.

In short, the program joins public and private resources in a common attack on developing the housing which low-income Americans in the cities, large and small, so badly need.

Both local and Federal tax burdens will benefit in the long run.

#### SECRETARY McNAMARA'S POSITION ON SOVIET-FIAT DEAL QUESTIONED

**The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDIE).** Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 30 minutes.

**Mr. LIPSCOMB.** Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Soviet Union and other Communist nations are supplying weapons and materials and supplies which are used to kill and maim our men and our allies in Vietnam it is especially difficult for Americans to see why we should help these very same Communist nations build up their economic and industrial strength.

What is also a matter of deep concern in this regard are some of the arguments and the tactics employed by administration spokesmen in trying to promote trade which would assist the Soviet Union and Communist countries in building up their economies.

One example I would like to bring to the attention of the House is a recent



statement by Secretary of Defense McNamara criticizing Congress for taking action aimed at denying U.S. financial assistance and exports of equipment to help equip the Fiat automobile plant to be constructed in the Soviet Union. As part of his argument that if we help build up the Soviet automobile industry Soviet resources will be diverted away from defense to consumer goods, the Secretary gave the impression that the Soviet Union has no automobile industry at this time.

The statement to which I refer appears in a printed interview with the Secretary in the September 29, 1967, issue of *Life* magazine. In his response to a question about areas of mutual interest between the United States and the Communists, the Secretary, in part, mentions trade, and said:

Look at the failure of Congress to support the Administration's program of building bridges of trade with the Eastern European nations. Its actions included the denial of the Administration's request to participate in the \$50 million loan to the Fiat Corporation to help the Soviets expand their automotive industry. This would be like putting them on dope. Once they get an automobile industry, they will never get off it. And that simply means they divert resources away from defense to consumer goods. How could that possibly be contrary to our interests? We are misguided if we fail to recognize these potential areas of common interest, as distinguished from their basic, aggressive foreign policy.

Note that he said, "Once they get an automobile industry."

It seems incredible that anyone in a position such as the Secretary of Defense would attempt to leave the American people with the idea that the Soviet Union has no automobile industry at present. Yet there seems to be no other way to interpret the comment, "Once they get an automobile industry \* \* \*" as set forth in that statement.

I think it is important that it be pointed out that the Secretary's statement is highly misleading.

Let there be no mistake or doubt in anyone's mind: The Soviet Union does today have an automobile industry.

The following is a brief description of brand-name passenger automobiles which are produced in the Soviet Socialist Republics as listed in car catalogs for 1966 and 1967:

**Chaika.**—Limousine, seven-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 8 cylinder in V; 192.3 net horsepower at 4400 rpm; automatic transmission; length—220.5 inches; weight—4079 pounds.

**Zil-111.**—Limousine, seven-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 8 cylinder in V; maximum 230 horsepower at 4200 rpm; automatic transmission; length—241.7 inches; weight—5732 pounds.

**Moskvich 408 (or Mzma 408).**—Sedan, five-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 60.5 horsepower at 4750 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—161 inches; weight—1984 pounds.

**Moskvich 426.**—Station wagon, five-passenger. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 60.5 horsepower at 4750 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—161 inches; weight—2116 pounds.

**Volga (Gas 21).**—Sedan, six-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 95 horsepower at 4000 rpm; transmission—3 gear plus reverse; length—189 inches; weight—2997 pounds.

**Volga (69M).**—Jeep-type vehicle, five-passenger, 4-door. Engine: 4 cylinder in line; maximum 72 horsepower at 3800 rpm; 4-wheel drive; transmission—3 gear plus reverse; length—152 inches; weight—3076 pounds.

**Zaporozhets 965A.**—Coupe, four-passenger, 2-door. Engine: 4 cylinder, Vee slanted; maximum 27 horsepower at 4000 rpm; transmission—4 gear plus reverse; length—131.1 inches; weight—1323 pounds.

Soviet automobiles are constructed at the following locations:

#### NAME OF FACTORY AND PRODUCT

Gorkiy Motor Vehicle Plant, Gaz trucks and Volga and Chaika autos.

Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant (Moscow), Zil trucks and Zil-114 autos.

Moscow Plant for Low Powered Vehicles, Moskvich autos.

Motor Vehicle Plant in the Urals (Miass), Ural-Zis trucks.

Ulyanovsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Uaz trucks.

Minsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Maz trucks.

Kremenchug Motor Vehicle Plant, Kraz trucks.

Zaporozh'ye Motor Vehicle Plant, Zaporozhets autos.

Izhevsk Motor Vehicle Plant, Moskvich autos.

Kutaisi Motor Vehicle Plant, Kaz trucks.

Belorussian Motor Vehicle Plant (Zhodino), Belaz trucks.

In addition to the above, there are many specialized automotive equipment plants, such as the Moscow carburetor plant, the Zavol'skiy engine plant, the Yaroslavl tire factory, and so on.

Also there are many additional plants properly belonging to other industries which supply materials to the Soviet automotive industry.

Some of the automobile factories, such as that in Gorki and the Likhachev in Moscow, are very large, highly integrated plants much like the Ford River Rouge plant in their self-sufficiency. The latter factory is reported to have approximately 70,000 people on the rolls.

As for their automobile manufacturing capability, the Soviet motor vehicle production in the year 1960, for example, was 362,000 trucks and 138,800 passenger cars. Soviet production by 1966 had risen to 408,000 trucks and 230,200 passenger cars. Incidentally, jeeps constitute about 17 percent of the annual production of what are classified as passenger cars in the Soviet Union.

While Soviet automotive production is well below automotive production for the United States, from these figures it is obvious that the Soviets have a significant automotive industry.

It is a matter of concern that the Secretary of Defense apparently saw fit to attempt to pass off to the American people that the Soviet Union has no automotive industry.

Possibly the Secretary felt this approach would be effective in connection with his follow-up comments that if the U.S.S.R. is supplied with credits, machine tools, and other capital goods for automotive production then that will somehow force the Communist Party leadership to alter their economic plans.

The Secretary's reference to diverting Soviet resources away from defense to consumer goods is, I believe, a commendable wish and a desirable hope. But

wishes and hopes cannot be the basis for national policy judgments.

In fact, the Central Intelligence Agency for one, in an intelligence report on the U.S.S.R. automobile industry which was reproduced in a March 1, 1967 committee print of the House Banking and Currency Committee, indicates that the Soviet automotive buildup will not divert resources away from their defense and space industries.

The CIA reports that the announced plans—for increased auto production—are not so grandiose as to require a significant alteration in traditional Soviet economic priorities, and would leave military and space programs unimpaired.

Such a finding is clearly understandable. The size of the Soviet automotive industry and the proportional output of autos and trucks, armored personnel carriers, buses, tanks, and tractors are based on decisions of the Communist Party leadership.

Output is centrally planned and rigidly controlled. Their planned product-mix, which limits the number of automobiles, certainly will not be altered or controlled by any wishful thinking that the Soviets will "divest resources away from defense to consumers goods."

The operation of Soviet industry and Soviet military and space programs are based upon the Soviet economic plan. This plan is law. Throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet empire it is the Soviet economic plan which has such a tyrannical impact on the lives of all peoples and, in fact, an adverse impact on peoples throughout the world. And what is the Soviet economic plan designed to accomplish? Nikolay Baybakov, the Chief of Soviet economic planners, put it this way:

The targets set in the plan for 1967 are designed to strengthen the economy and the defensive might of the USSR.

As for the idea that the products of the Soviet-Fiat plant will go to the average citizens of the U.S.S.R. and that this will start a movement which will force the Soviets to divert large segments of the economy toward filling consumer needs that will then develop, the CIA has studied that aspect of the planned expansion of the Soviet auto industry and has reported that:

Essentially, the new Soviet program is designed to produce automobiles for the bureaucratic and managerial elite, not for the average citizen.

Another important factor to consider, and this, of course, is not publicized by administration spokesmen, is that the Soviet Union is actually an exporter of automobiles. Soviet autos are now being exported to approximately 60 countries. And it appears Soviet autos will be exported in greatly increased numbers once the auto industry is expanded as the U.S. Secretary of Defense proposes that it should be.

It is estimated that 54,000 Soviet automobiles will be exported this year and that this number will increase about 500 percent to 250,000 by 1974 if the plans publicized by the Soviets should materialize.

Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that

the Soviet Union does, today, have an automobile industry and that the Soviet leadership wants to increase and update the production of automobiles in the Soviet Union.

It is also clear that the Soviet leadership seeks to enlarge this base without impairing Soviet military and space programs.

What is not so apparent and not so clear is just why the United States should at this time assist the Soviets in any way with their economic plans.

Our trade policies in this regard obviously can and do have a significant bearing on our national security and welfare. The House should, therefore, mount a special effort to look into and evaluate the implications of trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

This is a subject which relates closely to a number of areas of interest and jurisdiction from the point of view of our existing House committee structure. However, there is a need to create a means which can focus attention on and effectively embrace and represent all important aspects of the subject. For this reason, legislation has been introduced in the House, cosponsored by 120 Members of the House, to create a Select Committee on East-West Trade.

The committee would look into the impact of East-West trade on the productivity of nations which supply North Vietnam and other Communist nations with military, technical, economic or financial assistance, the extent of financial assistance given to nations supplying Hanoi and other Communist nations, and the effectiveness of U.S. laws and regulations on governing trade with such nations.

This legislation is pending before the House Rules Committee. As a cosponsor of the legislation, it was my privilege to appear before the Rules Committee on October 11 and 12 to testify in its behalf. The resolution on which hearings have been held is House Resolution 843.

As one who has long been interested in and concerned about what is occurring in the field of East-West trade, I respectfully solicit support for this legislation when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives for consideration and vote. There is a pressing need for the study that would be authorized by House Resolution 843.

**KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AT THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE LAIRD YOUTH LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP, WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, STEVENS POINT, WIS., MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1967**

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Education Day in central Wisconsin. It was my privilege to cosponsor with Wisconsin State University at Stevens Point an all-day conference of young

people and school officials from every high school in my congressional district.

I was especially pleased that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, accepted my invitation to keynote Education Day in the Seventh Congressional District and to participate in the highly successful youth leadership workshop portion.

The Secretary's remarks were so pertinent to the occasion that I think they should be read by every Member of this body. Under unanimous consent, I include Secretary Gardner's remarks before the luncheon banquet of the youth leadership workshop in the **RECORD** at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the program.

Mr. Speaker, Education Day in central Wisconsin is such a unique and rewarding undertaking that I would like to take a moment to acquaint my colleagues with it.

It is a two-part conference, cosponsored by Wisconsin State University and myself as the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District. There is an adult conference and a youth conference conducted simultaneously.

The youth conference, officially called the youth leadership workshop, is the highlight of Education Day.

At my invitation, two juniors and two seniors from each of the 63 high schools in our district were selected by student body action to attend the workshop.

Six discussion topics were established in six separate workshops for these students to discuss the top issues of our day with outstanding discussion leaders.

In addition to Secretary Gardner, for example, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, conducted a workshop on "Career Opportunities in a Changing World," and Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, commanding general of the 1st Armored Division at Fort Hood, Tex., was the discussion leader for the workshop on "The Individual and Foreign Military Policy." These top national leaders, together with the other resource leaders and moderators made Education Day the outstanding success it was.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the entire program for Education Day in central Wisconsin in the **RECORD** following the Secretary's address.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak too highly of Secretary Gardner's contribution to the success of Education Day. His remarks provided much food for thought for all who participated, and I feel they should be shared with my colleagues in this body.

His central point had to do with the problem in our society of attracting good young people into leadership roles in our society. To use the Secretary's words:

Ask our brightest and best young men and women what careers they intend to follow. How many plan to run for office? How many plan to enter State or local government? How many into national affairs? Of 3106 National Merit Scholars selected during the first 4 years of the program, less than 2 percent of the boys and about 6 percent of the girls looked forward to careers in government service. A followup study of the same Scholars a few years later showed that even fewer retained an interest in government service, 1.7

percent of the boys and 1.5 percent of the girls.

Now in our kind of society, government has no monopoly on leadership, so you might imagine that able young people such as these have in mind some of the other areas of vital leadership in our society. But they do not.

They aren't particularly interested in being corporation presidents, or labor leaders or university presidents. They want to be professionals—unentangled, unencumbered, unbeleaguered, loyal only to their craft.

Now I am all for professionals. They have created the modern world—but I don't hold that against them. They are a priceless asset to any society.

But we also need a steady flow of extremely capable people into the decision-making roles of the society. And we aren't getting enough of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary's comments, as you can see, are well taken. They are not made often enough by public officials in leadership capacities especially when talking to young people who are still deciding what kind of career of pursue.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Gardner's remarks made a profound impression on the young high school leaders who attended Education Day, and I am pleased to call them to the attention of my colleagues.

The material referred to above follows:

#### SECRETARY GARDNER'S REMARKS AT THE YOUTH LEADERSHIP LUNCHEON

When Woodrow Wilson asserted that our purpose in entering World War I was "to make the world safe for democracy," Gilbert Chesterton commented "The world will never be safe for democracy. It's a dangerous trade."

He was right. The governing of a free society is a difficult and hazardous business—full of trouble and traps for the unwary.

Since the time of Wilson and Chesterton, the world has become very much more complex. The rate of change has increased enormously. Questions of public policy have become immensely technical and resistant to common sense analysis.

To suggest the scope and difficulty of the tasks facing us, let me run through very quickly what I conceive to be the agenda for your generation.

(1) First, the most pressing problem of your generation, as it was for my generation and my parents' generation, will be to build an enduring peace. If the Viet Nam war were to end tomorrow, that problem would remain.

The task is not to abolish tensions among nations, which is quite impossible, but to create procedures and institutional arrangements that will hold those tensions within safe bounds.

(2) I'm not going to attempt to list these problems in any order of importance, but since we began with peace, I shall list next the closely related problem of the *developing nations*. The combination of poverty and rising expectations that exists among half the world's population today is as volatile and threatening in its own way as the bomb.

(3) Third is the problem of *population control*. Throughout the world there is a growing awareness of the gravity of unbridled population growth. There are now about 3.3 billion people in the world. By the year 2000 there will be an estimated 7.5 billion, most of them hungry. And as Harrison Brown says, "Hungry people are combustible."

(4) The fourth item on my list is *equality of opportunity*. Today, racial discrimination is the chief barrier to equality of opportunity, and that is why it is unquestionably our number one domestic problem. But the racial front is not the only one on which



we are struggling to provide equal access to the benefits of American life. There are other massive barriers to individual fulfillment—poverty, illness, ignorance, physical and mental handicaps. Our goal today is breathing in scope, but easy to describe. We don't want anyone to be hurt or handicapped or shut out from the life of the society by circumstances that can be prevented.

(5) The fifth problem on my list is a corollary to the fourth. It is to create an education system that will provide the maximum individual fulfillment for each American. In the slums of our great cities today boys and girls who could easily be brought to the full use of their powers are left stunted, inarticulate and angry. We need an educational system that will lift them. We need schools that will nurture talent, that will awaken the spark of curiosity and eagerness to learn.

(6) Sixth, we must bring new life to our cities. Today our cities are plagued with every conceivable ill—apathy, crime, poverty, racial conflict, slum housing, polluted air and water, inferior schools and hospitals, and snarled transportation. We are going to have to do more than build bridges between the inner city and its opulent periphery. We need a totally new concept of metropolitan organization.

(7) Seventh is the problem of our natural environment. We can't avoid some alteration of the natural world we live in. But man, even industrial man, is a part of nature, and must find some limit to the headlong destruction and fouling of the natural environment. How much fouled air can we breathe? How much filth can we spew into our rivers and lakes? How much bleakness and ugliness can we tolerate?

(8) Eighth is the problem of government, the age-old problem of how best to organize ourselves to accomplish our shared purposes. We have indulged ourselves far too long in the luxury of supposing that everything in this country must change and develop except our governmental structure and processes.

(9) My ninth problem concerns economic growth. Since the Great Depression we have made impressive gains in stabilizing and managing the economy. Because of what we now know about the sources of economic growth we can envisage the elimination of poverty, the rebuilding of our cities, wise use of our natural resources and more imaginative use of human skills.

(10) The final item on my agenda is the relationship of the individual to society. All that we achieve must finally be measured in terms of its effect on the individual. We set out to create a free and just society in which the individual could flourish. But our highly organized society carries its own threats to individuality.

The threats need not materialize. We can't escape size and complexity in our organizations and institutions, but we can design them so that they serve the individual as well as the system. Our goal should be a society designed for people, and if we want it badly enough we can have it.

It seems to me that those are the problems that constitute the agenda for your generation.

Whether or not we solve those problems will determine our survival as a nation. And our chances of solving them will depend heavily on the quality of leadership that the institutions and communities and States of this Nation can provide in the years ahead.

And I must tell you that with respect to the emergence of leaders we face a considerable problem.

With all their extraordinary vision, the Founding Fathers failed to foresee one fairly central difficulty that this Nation would face. They did not see that leadership in a free society would not prove to be the only or even the chief magnet for good men. They did not see that with the rise of the professions a

career ideal would emerge that would be far more attractive to our best young people than a career in public life or in any other leadership role.

Ask our brightest and best young men and women what careers they intend to follow. How many plan to run for office? How many plan to enter State or local government? How many into national affairs? Of 3106 National Merit Scholars selected during the first 4 years of the program, less than 2 percent of the boys and about 6 percent of the girls looked forward to careers in government service. A follow-up study of the same Scholars a few years later showed that even fewer retained an interest in government service, 1.7 percent of the boys and 1.5 percent of the girls.

Now in our kind of society, government has no monopoly on leadership, so you might imagine that able young people such as these have in mind some of the other areas of vital leadership in our society. But they do not.

They aren't particularly interested in being corporation presidents, or labor leaders or university presidents. They want to be professionals—unentangled, unencumbered, unbeleaguered, loyal only to their craft.

Now I am all for professionals. They have created the modern world—but I don't hold that against them. They are a priceless asset to any society.

But we also need a steady flow of extremely capable people into the decision-making roles of the society. And we aren't getting enough of them.

I believe that there are few facts in our national life more disturbing than that. Our society and our world have grown so complex, social change occurs at such a bewildering pace, and the sheer technical demands of leadership have mounted so swiftly that I think we're headed for disaster unless our ablest people take a hand in running the society.

We need them as leaders, not just as buttoned-up and buttoned-down professionals living secure and tidy lives. We need them as leaders in business and in education and in every other area of our national life—but most particularly we need them in public life.

We are producing the most educated, articulate and brilliant sidewalk superintendents the world has ever seen. We have a limitless supply of people with the intelligence and expertise to analyze the society's problems, but very, very few with the motivation and stamina to leap in and help solve them.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the gravity and complexity of some of the problems we face today. To solve them is going to require a great surge of citizen dedication.

It has always been hard to stir our people to significant social action except in periods of great crisis. I would have no hope of changing that national attribute. I would simply say that another of our historic moments of crisis is upon us.

During the years ahead, our society will need the lifelong attention and concern of its most highly educated young people. They must lend a hand.

And those who hope to change the world for the better will have to have the fortitude and the staying power essential to the long, difficult task of accomplishing social change. Making a bad world better is tough, grinding, never-ending work.

I have little sympathy with those who have impossibly high hopes for social betterment and then the next day are wallowing in disillusionment and self-pity because their high hopes weren't realized. Social change isn't that easy. Creating a better world isn't that easy. Life isn't that easy.

If enough of our young people are willing to commit themselves to a serious concern for the future of their society, then I have some hope for the years ahead. As some of you know, I have been keenly interested in

what it is that makes nations decay. And as those of you who have read my book *Self-Renewal* know, the evidence convinces me that the decline of nations is not inevitable. As I said in the book if we go into a decline, we shall not be able to blame the inexorable forces of history. It will be an avoidable failure of the mind and heart and spirit of the American people. We now know beyond all doubt that nations die from within, and they are attacked less often by traitors within the gate than by traitors within the heart—complacency, apathy, cynicism, intolerance, self-deception and an unwillingness on the part of the individual to lend himself to any worthy common purpose.

Every morning and evening as I ride to and from work, I pass the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and I often think of the men and events they commemorate. But as I look at the perfection of the monuments, I try to remember—and I ask you young people to remember—that this great Nation was conceived and designed by human beings, imperfect as you and I are imperfect; capable of mistakes, even as you and I; who were once young, as you are now; who were subject to weariness and doubt and confusion, as all of us are. But with all their human fallibility, they had the courage and heart to believe that man might create a free and just society. And that made all the difference.

It is easy to be cynical about that effort because no society anywhere or anytime has really been wholly free and just. But over the years and over the generations we have moved slowly and often painfully toward those goals. And we have done so because some people had the vision and the steadfastness to try to make an imperfect world better.

That is hard and not always glamorous work and it is never finished.

A nation is never finished. It has to be built and rebuilt. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women. It is now your turn.

The agenda for your generation—the list of tasks that must be undertaken if our nation is to survive, and if your world is to be a better world—is formidable. I hope that each of you will care enough to lend a hand.

#### EDUCATION DAY IN THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OCTOBER 23, 1967

(Sponsored by Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, and the Laird Youth Leadership Foundation; keynote, John W. Gardner, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

#### YOUTH LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

8:00-9:15: Registration. (Coffee and milk served in Frank Lloyd Wright Lounge for registrants.)

9:15: Opening session, Wisconsin Room of the University Center. Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU-Stevens Point, and Congressman Mel Laird, 7th Congressional District.

9:45: Workshops convene. Muir-Schurz Room: *The Individual and Foreign-Military Policy*. Its effect upon our nation and you. Major General Richard G. Stilwell, formerly Chief of Staff, U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam. Currently, commanding general 1st Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

Nicolet-Marquette Room: *The Individual and Career Opportunities in a Changing World* (Learning, earning, and yearning). Esther Peterson, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor.

General Billy Mitchell Room: *The Individual and Morality: Respect for Law and Order*. Father Stephen Boehrer, Chairman Religious Department, Holy Cross Seminary, La Crosse and Professor of Theology, Viterbo College, La Crosse.

Hamlin-Garland Room: *The Individual and the Equality of Man*. The Reverend Perry

Saito, Pastor, Lake Street Methodist Church, Eau Claire, and member of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights.

Charles Van Hise Room: *The Federal System: Who Governs Whom?* Dr. John Bibby, Assistant Professor Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Frederick Jackson Turner Room: *Responsibilities of Business and Industry to Society*. Kenneth Haagensen, Executive Vice President, Wis. State Chamber of Commerce.

11:10: Reconvene in general session, Wisconsin Room. Summary reports by workshop moderators.

11:40: Open discussion, Wisconsin Room. Moderator, Congressman Mel Laird. Participants: Workshop resource leaders and students.

12:30: Luncheon, Allen Center. (Combined attendance everyone participating in both conferences.) Keynote address, John W. Gardner, U.S. Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

2:00: Afternoon Workshops Convene, Mulr-Schurz Room: *The Individual and Foreign-Military Policy*.

Nicolet-Marquette Room: *The Individual and Career Opportunities in a Changing World*. (Learning, earning and yearning.)

General Billy Mitchell Room: *The Individual and Morality: Respect for Law and Order*.

Hamlin-Garland Room: *The Individual and the Equality of Man*.

Charles Van Hise Room: *The Federal System: Who Governs Whom?*

Frederick Jackson Turner Room: *Responsibilities of Business and Industry to Society*.

3:25: Reconvene general session in Wisconsin Room. Open discussion with John Gardner, all resource people, moderators, students participating. Moderator, Congressman Laird.

3:50: Final Summaries: Resource Leaders and Congressman Laird.

4:15: Presentations: Certificates to student participants.

5:00: Adjourn.

#### ADULT WORKSHOP

*Education in central Wisconsin—Our students, their needs and government resources*

12:30: Luncheon, the Allen Center, University Campus. Welcome by Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU-Stevens Point. Introduction of conference leaders by Congressman Mel Laird.

1:15: Keynote address. John Gardner, U.S. Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

2:00: Workshop session, Wisconsin Room, University Center. *The Village Center*, Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, President, WSU, Stevens Point. *How the Regional Office Can Help You*, Dr. Peter Mousolite, Regional representative of U.S. Office of Education. *Educational Projections to 1984 in Central Wisconsin*, Leon Case, Coordinator, Educational Service, Agency No. 7.

2:40: Workshop session, Wisconsin Room. *Changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Program*. B. Alden Lillywhite, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Changes in the Higher Education Program*, Dr. J. Wayne Reitz, Director Graduate Programs, Bureau of Higher Education.

3:25: General Session, Wisconsin Room. Reconvene with Youth Leadership Workshop participants. (Everyone is invited to join with the students and resource leaders for the discussion and summary of the Youth Workshop.)

#### STUDENTS ATTENDING

Paul Kinkhammer, Lou Ann Rueden, Fred Dauffenbach, Bob Maslanka, Abbottsford Senior High School.

Bill Broga, Jill Garringer, Darrell Renner, Elma C. Staples, Adams-Friendship High School.

Shirley Peterson, Michael Smart, Cindy Cooper, William H. Gilbert, Alexander High School, Neekoosa.

Bruce Koehn, John Mehne, Patricia J. Swan, Mary Kay Wysocik, Almond High School.

Daniel Glodowski, Timothy Harvey, Michael Patoka, Judy Wimpe, Amherst High School.

Mary Blaskey, Mark J. Bradley, Danene Rabe, Charles Szmanda, Antigo Senior High School.

Beverly Bade, Gary F. Getzin, Thomas Thibodeau, Rosemarie Tosch, Assumption High School, Wisconsin Rapids.

Gayle Ann Punke, Roger Weller, Gary Guralski, Rita Lesczynski, Athens High School.

Victor Karaliunas, Dawn Kolstad, Sue Ellen Grassl, Claudine Weber, Auburndale High School.

Cindy Beversdorf, Randy TenHaken, Elaine Bauch, Michael B. Knauf, Birnamwood High School.

Michael L. Lorge, Robert H. Stark, Gary J. Jansen, Robert L. Meyer, Blessed Sacrament Seminary.

Carol Krause, Tom Magee, Susan Kupsky, John Simon, Bonduel High School.

Gail M. Grosskopf, Jeanne Marquardt, Susan Bents, Robert Brel, Bowler High School.

Beverly Bate, Kenneth Eberhardt, Ann Kay Arvey, Terry L. Olson, Clintonville Senior High School.

Gene Reineking, James Staffell, Barbara Meyer, Joyce Tesmer, Colby High School.

Stanley Charron, Thomas J. Schuetz, James Haselberger, Fritz Hastreiter, Columbus High School, Marshfield.

Peter J. Davison, Tom Tupper, John Halverson, Katherine S. Wilson, Crandon High School.

William Alexejun, Douglas W. Tietz, Robert Gibbs, JoAnne Webster, D. C. Everest Junior-Senior H. S., Schofield.

Barbara Burger, Nancy Ann King, Gary Fergot, David Joswiak, Edgar High School.

Sheldon Bergen, Linda Boettcher, Bonnie Froland, David Marquard, Elcho High School.

Kathleen Bruehl, William Olson, Mary Landry, David Nevaranta, Florence High School.

Cynthia Butek, Joe Pawlik, Jim Galarowicz, Josephine Sromek, Gilman High School.

Elaine Anderson, Colleen Angel, John Hilbert, Terrance Rand, Granton High School.

Jim Behrens, Warren A. Mondloch, Duane Jackson, Bill Toburen, Greenwood High School.

Ted Gjerston, Charles Koehler, John Bobbe, Bruce Meagher, Iola-Scandinavia High School.

John Cronkrite, Molly Killoren, Ronald W. Otto, Krista Van Engelen, John Edwards High School, Port Edwards.

Nancy Clark, James H. Weldner, Matthew Annis, Andrea Milak, Laona High School.

Lyle R. Helke, Susan Ann Hoffman, Thomas Molski, Marty Tuus, Lincoln High School, Wisconsin Rapids.

Kenneth Trnka, Randy Zimmerman, Randy Haslow, Paul L. Noeldner, Loyal High School.

Colleen Mary Casey, Scott A. Ploger, Marsha A. Lindsay, Michael R. Marey, Manawa High School.

Kathryn R. Ross, Raymond Starzinski, Gary Ruplinger, Alvina Starzinski, Marthon High School.

Gail B. Gregor, Monica Soroka, Cindy Sorenson, Sheila M. Stark, Maria High School, Stevens Point.

Charles Anderson, Cristy Byers, Patricia Halpog, Katie McInnis, Marion High School.

Melaine Murray, Letha Wood, Katherine Custer, Mary Restall, Marshfield Senior High School.

Kathy Cashman, Joan Schmitt, Thomas A. Lindow, Paul Stenklyft, Medford High School.

Brian Jensen, Stuart A. Kraft, David

Adams, Susan Schotz, Merrill Senior High School.

Neil Bandt, Rae Lynn Johnson, Paula Coddington, Richard Orienti, Montello High School.

Steve Jonas, Mary Liedtke, Goerge Knoedler, Beth Scholtens, Mosinee High School.

Mary Lou Olson, Howard Paulson, Victor Lutz, Marcy Van Gorden, Neillsville High School.

Patricia Lynett, Patrick K. Riley, Gregory Laska, Anne Vander Wall, Newman High School, Wausau.

Linda Hildebrand, Kathi Otis, Randy Judd, Therese McLaughlin, New London Senior High School.

Maxine Albrecht, Pam Hodgson, Our Lady of the Holy Cross H. S., Merrill.

Steve Johnson, Kay P. Klabon, Kris Lee Arneson, Allen Beck, Owen-Withee High School.

Brian Eagon, Rick Hurlbut, John A. Lehman, Carl Yambert, P. J. Jacobs High School, Stevens Point.

Wayne Bushman, Larry Cundari, Bob Breitenstein, Wayne Kostroski, Pacelli High School, Stevens Point.

Jake Emmerick, Janice Jagielo, Bjorne S. Jensen, Steve Miner, Pittsville High School.

Richard Reichert, David Rhody, Karen Niggemann, Randy Powers, Rib Lake High School.

Barbara Sommers, Mike Wanserski, Ralph Laska, Cindy Larson, Rosholt High School.

Linda Kriewaldt, Kurt Kroenke, Jean Raddant, Greg Zeoske, Shawano Senior High School.

Bruce Michael Cook, Patrick Staage, M. Constance Carpenter, Francis E. Manina, Spencer High School.

Susan Franckowiak, Kirk Klemme, David Gliniecki, Myra J. Meissner, Stratford High School.

Mark Ahles, Douglas Woodworth, Gwen Ellyn Anderson, Debbie Haas, Thorp High School.

Barbara Breitenfeldt, Harvey W. Kriegel, Jr., Anna Hirt, John Laatsch, Tigerton High School.

Cynthia Fischer, Kathleen Sweeney, John Drew, Robert Steigerwaldt, Tomahawk High School.

Dale Reid, Sherry Renner, Lenny Palek, Debbie Warner, Tri-County Area High School, Plainfield.

Ted Bartels, Joan Neuenfeldt, Marilyn Neddoo, George Scheenzer, Wabeno High School.

Sue Holly, Eric Peterson, Kathleen McGinnis, Lee Morey, Waupaca High School.

Anthony S. Albright, Stephen Schaller, Evan Jay Cutting, Eric Wuennenberg, Wausau Senior High School.

Tom Pearson, Cheryl Schwebel, Pat Henne, Donald Nowak, Wautoma High School.

Marcia Rumann, John Schreiber, Charlene Quinn, Westfield High School.

Tom Hartfield, Ann Hutchison, James Nolan, Janice Wendt, Weyauwega High School.

William Conn, Myron D. Heistad, Colleen Peters, Susan J. Robinson, White Lake High School.

Jim Osypowski, Steve Shoemaker, Sally Graves, Linda Linke, Wittenberg High School.

#### FRAUDULENT STOCK SALES BY OHIO FARM BUREAU COOPERATIVES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?



There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, writing about a brilliant con game, O. Henry once said:

It was beautiful and simple as all truly great swindles are.

O. Henry might well have been writing about the Farm Bureau's activities in the State of Ohio—activities, by the way, to which the attorney general of that State has given his fatherly blessing.

Several days ago, I introduced an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer describing how the Tuscarawas County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association established an egg producing business which promptly moved into the market and undersold its own members, driving many of them out of business.

As swindles go, it was not a bad effort at all. But for sheer "beauty" and "simplicity," not to mention the necessary touches of tragedy and heartache, it does not hold a candle to the activities of the Holmes County and Portage County Farm Bureau Cooperatives in the Buckeye State. These groups have developed a ruthlessly simple and direct method of making money. Taking advantage of the phony "Snow White" image they have carefully built up over the years, they sell unregistered, worthless stock to helpless and unsuspecting farmers. The farmers buy it without even seeing a prospectus or financial statement, in the innocent belief that it is a safe, conservative investment. The stock is sold with the promise that the Farm Bureau Cooperative will redeem it at any time upon 30 days notice. But the promise, given verbally, is forgotten immediately. The stock is not redeemed in 30 days. It is not redeemed in 30 months. From all present indications, it will not be redeemed in 30 years, despite great financial hardship and personal anguish being suffered by the owners of the stock.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, in the greatest tradition of crusading, responsible American journalism, has put the spotlight on these criminal acts. It has very recently written in depth about the circumstances and consequences of two such fraudulent sales—sales made to poor, hard-working farm families who sunk all they had into this worthless stock, and who now live on the grim edge of poverty because their stock certificates cannot be redeemed, sold, traded, or used as collateral, and which does not even draw dividends.

Both articles tell essentially the same story of calculating deception on one side, and despair and desperation on the other. In both cases, the stock is now owned by women who must make their own way in the world, and who have nowhere to turn for help. The Farm Bureau Cooperatives which sold them the stock have turned their backs on them and have made it clear that they feel no responsibility toward the purchasers of this stock. I have personally checked these stories out, and have verified their accuracy.

These stories are simply one more variation in the Farm Bureau's favorite game, "farming the American farmer." Under unanimous consent, I respectfully include these articles in the Record so

that they can be brought to the attention of all the American people:

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 12, 1967]

WOMAN IN NEED CAN'T SELL CO-OP STOCK

(By Richard C. Bixler)

KENT.—Mrs. Helen Dingeldein used \$1,000 she inherited from her mother's estate to buy preferred stock in the Portage County Farm Bureau Co-operative Association, Inc., in 1949 and 1950.

Soon after, she was left alone to rear two sons and try to provide a good education for them with a scanty income. She said she could have used the \$1,000. She tried to redeem the stock at the co-op and to sell it to others. To this day, she has been unable to redeem or sell it.

Operations of farm bureau co-ops in Ohio presently are being investigated by U.S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., who has criticized some of their practices as a "con game."

Farm Bureau officials in several counties have told The Plain Dealer they regret being unable to redeem patronage dividends issued to members instead of cash earnings.

"These farmers are really not out of pocket on anything," one farm bureau official said. "They didn't put anything into the stock. They just didn't get the cash dividends it represents, but maybe one of these days they will."

Mrs. Dingeldein's situation is different. She did pay cash to buy her stock.

She is out of pocket money she has needed many years.

She now has written to The Plain Dealer, seeking help after all else has failed.

Mrs. Dingeldein lives in a large rooming house here at 227 E. Summit Street. The house is owned by her oldest son, who provides rented rooms for Kent State University students.

She and her sister, Miss Anna Mudrick, live in a small apartment on the ground floor which "we get at a reduced rate for helping look after the house," Mrs. Dingeldein said.

"My husband and the boys and I lived on a small, 25-acre farm when I bought the stock. We bought a little feed from the farm bureau and when I inherited the money, the salesman who sold us the feed convinced me it would be a good investment.

"The first two or three years it paid a small dividend. After that we didn't get anything from it.

My husband left us. I got a divorce. I got a job but it was hard to make enough money to get along. I especially wanted to get the money back when the boys were in college, but I kept getting the runaround from the people in the office at Ravenna."

Mrs. Dingeldein has four certificates. The first is dated April 26, 1949, and is for 16 shares of preferred stock with par value of \$25 per share. The others are for eight each of the same shares and are dated Nov. 17, 1949; March 24, 1950, and July 13, 1950.

They are issued in the names of Mrs. Helen Dingeldein and Miss Anna Mudrick, who both said has worked to help support Mrs. Dingeldein's sons, said she would want Mrs. Dingeldein to have the money if the stock could be sold or redeemed.

Mrs. Dingeldein said the last communication she had from the Ravenna Landmark office was a letter dated Nov. 19, 1963. It stated:

"Dear Mrs. Dingeldein: In regards your letter asking for a record showing that you did not receive dividends from your stock.

"There has been no dividends paid on this stock for a few years back; and there is no net worth at present time on county stock. Hoping this answers your question, if any other please feel free to call.

"JOHN WESTERBECK,

"Manager."

Mrs. Dingeldein is 52. She has been unable to find work for several years. She said:

"Any place you go they either want some-

one under 40 or someone with a college degree. I just can't find anything and the boys have their hands full supporting themselves."

Earl Villers, of Edinburg in southeastern Portage County, is serving his fifth year as president of the co-op's board of directors.

Villers said the co-op in Portage County, like many others, has a history of many losing years. Stock value had gone far below net worth and even though the co-op has made money the last few years it will be several more before the stock regains its original value, he said.

"It is true. There have been cases of real hardship and these are unfortunate," Villers said.

"Preferred stock should be worth at least its par value and the owner should be able to trade it the same as any other corporation stock on the stock market. But because of the bad years the value has dropped to nothing.

"In a private corporation this would never have been allowed to happen. After two or three losing years, the directors would have been forced to close down, sell out or merge with another company."

Villers continued:

"But our directors kept operating in the red, hoping the next year would be better. The same laws do not apply to co-ops that govern private corporations.

"Our stockholders not only didn't get dividends but they were unable to sell or redeem their stocks. We can't redeem it because the law forbids it as long as its worth is less than par value."

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 19, 1967]

WOMAN MAY HAVE TO SELL HOME DESPITE CO-OP STOCK

(By Richard C. Bixler)

NASHVILLE, OHIO.—Gladys Reed, 67, says she will soon have to sell her family home here in this Holmes County Village unless she is somehow able to recover her life savings of \$5,000 tied up in stock of the county farm bureau.

U.S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., is checking Miss Reed's complaint against the county farm bureau in connection with his one-man investigation of U.S. farm co-ops and those in Ohio.

Miss Reed said she took her savings out of a local bank when a farm bureau stock salesman assured her the money would earn higher interest and would be readily available should she need it.

"During the depression," Miss Reed said, "my dad had to let his insurance lapse. I knew if he or mother ever got sick, it would fall to me to pay the bills.

"I worked as a domestic and at factory jobs in Akron and Shreve, and saved as much as I could."

Miss Reed's father was an interior decorator. Her family never had anything to do with farming or the farm bureau. But they were well acquainted with the manager of the Holmes County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc.

"He worked on my folks and then on weekends he'd talk to me trying to get me to buy this stock," she said. "He kept telling me that the bank was only paying 1½% or 2% interest and he could guarantee me 4% in dividends."

"I told him I wouldn't be interested because if anyone got sick, I wanted to be able to draw out money right away. He said he would guarantee me I could get all my money any time after 30 days' notice."

Miss Reed holds certificates that show she purchased stock in \$1,000 lots in 1950, 1951, twice in 1952, and 1957.

Her records show she received dividends of about 4% a year through December, 1960, but none since then. She paid federal income tax of about 20% on each dividend, and personal property tax of \$10 a year on the stock



several years after it ceased paying dividends, leaving her with net gain of no more and maybe less than bank interest would have amounted to, she figures.

"In March, 1961, Dad got sick," she recalled, "and I went to the Farm Bureau office to redeem some of the stock," she related. "The manager was no longer there and the new manager said he would have to check with the directors. Later, they told me they were sorry, but they couldn't redeem it."

"Dad died in June, 1961, and there was a large funeral bill to pay. I asked them again to redeem some stock and they again said they were sorry but they couldn't do it."

"Then, in 1962, mother broke both hips and someone had to be with her all the time. If I had been able to get that farm bureau stock money I could have hired help. But at what I was making it would have taken all my pay to hire someone. The farm bureau again refused to help me."

"I had to quit work and take early retirement on Social Security at age 62, at a 20% cut below what I would have got at age 65. I wouldn't have lost that if I could have cashed in my stock, either."

Miss Reed's mother died in 1964, leaving another funeral bill to be paid. She tried again to redeem farm bureau stock and said she received "the same tired answer 'we're sorry but . . .'" She said she could probably live the rest of her life in the nine-room home if she could get back her \$5,000.

Miss Reed had consulted Loudonville lawyer Donald Nash on other legal matters over the years. She recently asked his advice on her stock redemption problem. Nash wrote and talked to local co-op officials.

Nash said he was told "that the co-op was in financial trouble and that its debts and liabilities amounted to more than its net worth, thusly the stock presently has no value."

Last month Nash wrote a letter to the co-op in which he complained about Miss Reed's inability to get cash for her stock. He questioned the co-op's action in selling the last \$1,000 worth of stock in 1957 when the co-op's annual report showed operating losses of \$286.

Nash said he believed it might have been illegal to sell stock and guarantee redemption in 30 days when the business was operating at a loss and couldn't even pay debts it already owed.

A 10-year statement issued in 1964 showed the co-op lost money every year from 1957 on, with total losses through 1964 of more than \$150,000.

In the Sept. 7 letter, Nash also stated he planned to offer help to Mrs. Norma Williams, of Nova (northern Ashland County) who has been unable to redeem patronage dividend stock. Mrs. Williams was among the first to write Congress about questionable practices of the Farm Bureau.

In answer to his letter to the Holmes County co-op, Nash received a letter from the law firm of Howard Dresbach & George W. Morrison of Columbus. It said, in part:

"There is no similarity between your client's problem and that of Mrs. Williams. Your offer to help Mrs. Williams is a questionable practice and you would be well advised to refrain from doing what you suggest in your letter of Sept. 1, 1967."

Nash said: "If this is not an outright threat, then it is certainly a matter of them questioning my integrity. The implication is that I'm soliciting business. I didn't intend to charge Mrs. Williams a nickel for anything I might be able to do for her. There is no Legal Aid Society in Ashland County to handle cases for people who do not have sufficient funds to hire a lawyer, in civil matters."

"But as an officer of the courts, I have an obligation to help these people and that's exactly what I'm doing. I'm not charging Miss Reed, either, if it matters."

## SELF-HELPING HOUSING

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, nearly half of all the substandard housing in this country can be found in our rural areas, where only a third of our total population resides. In the same rural areas, half of our Nation's poor families reside.

In the face of these grim facts, it might seem there is little hope to better the housing conditions in rural America—other than a massive housing subsidy program. Low-income families, rural or urban, just do not have the debt-repaying ability to finance new homes.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is now developing a self-help housing program for low-income rural families that holds great promise for improved housing for many poor people.

In my own congressional district, a Farmers Home Administration-financed self-help housing project will soon be completed at Ellenville in Ulster County, N.Y., which will provide new housing for seven families—all of them with family incomes of less than \$5,000 per year.

The project is being made possible by USDA-FHA loans to the seven families totaling \$75,780 at 4 percent interest, which were used to buy building lots and materials from a local dealer, plus funds furnished by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purchase of tools and to hire a skilled construction supervisor.

When completed, the families will have all-modern homes with monthly payments on loans that will average less than \$50.

Today, most of the same families are paying more than this in rent for grossly inferior living space.

To build their homes, which are mostly in the three-bedroom, 1,000-square-foot category, the heads of the seven families work evenings and weekends in helping each other build the homes. They work together in a cooperative effort and they estimate the self-help effort saves them at least 25 percent of the cost of their homes.

In the few years, Mr. Speaker, during which the Farmers Home Administration has been experimenting with this self-help housing project, nearly 400 such homes have been built under the FHA program.

In addition to providing new and adequate housing for low-income rural people, the program has had another notable and beneficial effect. Many of the men have learned the fundamentals of the building trade and with additional experience have now become first-class carpenters with steady employment and incomes much greater than they had before.

I have high praise for the Farmers Home Administration for pioneering and

experimenting in this program to bring better housing to rural people who could not afford it under the usual policies of the program.

And, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the seven wonderful families of Ellenville, for their enterprise, their fine cooperative efforts, and their sense of pride that truly makes this project possible.

## ST. MARY OF NAZARETH HOSPITAL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Sister Mary Edelburg Slomka is administrator of the St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital at 1120 North Leavitt, Chicago, Ill. This hospital is located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent.

Sister Mary Edelburg is one of the outstanding hospital administrators in our city. She has done a remarkable job in purchasing new equipment so that St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital today has the finest medical equipment in every department and is efficiently meeting the needs and wants of the people of the Seventh District of Illinois.

All of us know if we are to provide the best medical facilities available to care for the health needs of the people of our Nation that our Government must establish a partnership with these hospitals and the communities which they serve in order to meet these health needs.

Sister Mary Edelburg has written an article on the organization of a department of government relations in a voluntary hospital as evidence of ongoing partnership. I am happy to insert excerpts from her article at this point in the RECORD because it will help all of us to better understand the problem of providing adequate health facilities for our communities:

### INTRODUCTION

Many fear for the future of the voluntary hospital in the face of continued extension of Government financing of hospital construction and services. Thus, it is essential that a positive outlook be adopted to facilitate an orderly analysis and a non-disruptive evolution of trends which affect services, economics and organization of hospitals.

### ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

The increased complexity of hospitals, a larger number of programs that are Government-sponsored, economic, social and political pressures, the psychological and physical demands, the meeting of ethical standards—in short the gamut of environments exerting pressure and emphasis on the hospital complex—calls for more than a cursory review of the ecology of the hospital and its effects on the hospital.

### ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

Hospitals long have worked cooperatively to control economic forces through sophisticated accounting, data processing, and more recently with advanced systems. Supply of services was always geared to public need and demand regardless of the economic status of the individual. Of recent date, the Medicare Program has focused attention to



the economic aspects of hospital organization.

#### SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

The sociological program has been emphasized mainly through the various personnel management programs, group dynamic techniques in their approach to organized decision making systems, and the behavioral sciences in their effect on the "person" and the "other-oriented" methods. The influx of social welfare agencies resulted from the recent emphasis in education on sociology and its related sciences.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

The psychological environment has been given specific attention through educational programs in which the "individual" patient, employee, or group needs were stressed and given concentrated attention, so stimulating as to create programs of psychological testing, guidance and counseling techniques, self-teaching and the like, all in an effort to satisfy needs of the person, to offer greater security and fulfillment.

#### ETHICAL ENVIRONMENT

Hospitals have traditionally based their services on high ethical code standards such as those promulgated by the Hippocratic Oath and the Florence Nightingale pledge. The origin of hospitals attests to the moral response to individual human needs. The professions themselves have developed criteria of membership with such high ethical standards that the preservation of these codes and standards has spelled the success of these provisions and contributed generously to the dignity in care of the patient and the public.

#### PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

In their development, hospitals have emphasized the physical environment as conducive to good patient care, with the restorative and rehabilitative powers of such are basic.

#### POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT

When considering the political for sake of political environment, there appears to be a deficiency in portraying demonstrably the hospital's position in relationship to the political world. The recent Government intervention in health care and its various aspects, with Medicare itself being the most prominent factor affecting all hospitals across the board, indicates that hospitals are for the first time facing the fact of the political environment. The impact of this fact calls for immediate action. The effect of Government intervention is far and wide and will be sensed throughout the hospital field to the extent that every service will be affected by it. However, it is obvious that as long as passivity will be assumed by hospitals, governmental control will be imposed to a far greater extent. The only logical course of action that appears to be valid is that of hospital initiative by positive and cooperative association with government. The concept of association indicates some type of correlation based on equality of prerogatives. It indicates equality in rights and obligations, regardless of the role of either, complementary, supportive or otherwise. Each must sense and fulfill responsibility of obligation. Each must assure control over an area of responsibility and activity. It will be contrary to the law of partnership to exercise control over activities that do not fall within the realm of action, performance or responsibility. Hence, to combat Government control over the quality of service, the hospital must exert efforts to initiate the programs that spell high quality. If the economics of such a program are beyond the reach of the institutional capacity, then governmental subsidy is required, but only after both the hospital and the Government set the standards of quality. Likewise, the extent of Government subsidy and controls over economic

support and expenditures should be cooperatively defined and realistically controlled by methods cooperatively predetermined.

If the hospital retains the role of provider of services, it must retain the responsibility for determinations of that service. If Government retains the role of associate in the provision of health, it, too, must be participative in rendering such services to hospitals that are supplementary and or complementary of that service rather than usurp total control. The hospital and the Government together can determine what the care will be and how the care will be provided. Private enterprise cannot be squelched. It should be encouraged to effect public welfare. Defining the role of the Government and the role of the hospital in the association must allow for the mutual success of the program in behalf of public interest without the need for disengaging either the hospital or the Government from the health program and likewise without having over-riding controls for one over the other. It is hoped that a simple resolution to a complex problem is in the offing.

#### TOWARD THE SOLUTION

Kenneth Williamson of the American Hospital Association recently stated that "the partnership will succeed only if the voluntary field recognizes its potential; is determined to meet the needs; is willing to change, and puts forth every ounce of effort as a responsible leader, as a firm advocate of the wisdom of voluntary effort, and maintains a staunch and constant role as a defender of individual thought and opinion."

#### ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

If partnership is the solution to governmental participation in health programs, what are the proposals that need be examined. Solutions may be complex or simple:

1. The possibility of the Government permitting hospitals to continue in their services to the public on a voluntary basis without Government intervention.

2. The possibility of hospitals becoming "servants" of the Government and under Government leadership and control with hospitals under one governmental authoritative body.

3. Hospitals, on a local basis, possibly joining hands with the Government, each providing complementary services, in mutual association servicing the health needs as well as economic needs of the public.

Such may result through an organized program of governmental relations constituted in a department such as public relations.

Alternative 1 is not the solution because hospitals have attempted to continue their services on a basis that would be public-satisfying. However, the needs of the indigent groups were not met because of such person's lack of ability to pay for services necessary. The needs of the indigent group were cyclically affected because of economic status. Usual health environmental needs were not provided for and increased illness incidences resulted, increased frequency of hospitalization was required, increased demands for money to provide for medical needs was necessary, no money was available, public taxation doubled, and public solicitation for assistance to satisfy needs of indigent tripled the burden of the public. In final analysis, this alternative provided no solution to health care provision. Supportive assistance was necessary, adequate assistance which could not be borne by the hospital if continued services were to be rendered, and improvements in care facilities, requiring a heavy outlay of capital and labor, made. Hospitals cannot afford to go it alone.

Alternative 2 is not a choice because it interferes with the American way of life which encourages free enterprise. The public sets the standards of health care to a great extent. It also realizes that such standards

must be achieved. If a hospital cannot attain and maintain standards the public demands, the Government is forced to edge its way in and to assume responsibility of such care in terms of public welfare. However, if total health care is Government provided, the Government will set standards, it will indicate the limits of such care, and hence the voice of the public will be lessened, power and governmental control will become imposed on the public and voluntariness and democracy will disappear.

Alternative 3: Hospitals and the Government can develop an association that will provide a program of health for the public that is:

1. In the interest of the public.
2. Provided voluntarily.
3. Supported by the Government in areas that neither the Government nor the hospital can function alone.

To implement a solution as proposed under alternative #3, it is recommended that a hospital department of Government Relations be established that will in a positive manner emphasize the cooperative relations that exist in the hospital with government sponsored agencies, that will provide recognition to the promotions of governmental good will, that will engender understanding of hospital problems.

#### Analysis of solution on environmental theory basis

There is evidence found to support a belief that changing environment plays a significant role in corporate growth. It provides the opportunities on which institutions are able to capitalize. Institutional growth seldom occurs without the helping stimulus of environmental change. Once the environmental stimulus is present, management is the intermediary link able to translate potential into actual growth in these ways:

1. Proper timing of action in response to stimulus.
2. Effective long range strategy.
3. Courage and willingness to shift to service fields of greater potential.

The result of unawareness of changes in Government policy as it relates to health care can lead to crisis management. Hospitals cannot panic for such panic would be at public expense.

The diagram in Exhibit 1, shows the process of growth designed as a method to illustrate the relationship of environmental change to institutional growth and to demonstrate the critical importance of the timing of strategic institutional planning.

The importance of the services of a hospital as a determinant of growth is great. However, it is vital that sufficient emphasis be given to the institution's outlook on what might happen in its environment in contrast to what is happening. Thus, management must recognize institutional potential, must work energetically and courageously to plan growth by recognizing opportunities that will yield service to the public, and must have a willingness to commit corporate destiny to this conviction.

1. Management must be aware of potential for change and have an open mind and willingness to acknowledge that future many and will be different from present.

2. Management must identify changes with an organized program of monitoring present and potential changes, together with a method for identifying opportunities.

3. Management must determine which opportunities or threats are inherent in the changes that fit the hospital's capabilities and goals. It must have the inventive ability necessary to translate potential trends into tangible services.

4. Management must develop and implement a strategic long range plan to capitalize on the opportunity to avoid such threats.

In order to plan for change caused by gov-



environmental intervention in health services, a Department of Government Relations is recommended which should be included in hospital organization chart.

In the past, legislators have been hopeful that voluntary hospitals would provide the leadership and plan for government's essential role in health care. It is suggested in the discussion, that hospitals seize in a last attempt the opportunity to recoup the position that could have been theirs. This can be achieved through a cooperative venture of hospitals with government. On the practical level, this requires the establishment of a Department of Government Relations to give evidence of such willingness. What is recommended in this presentation is only a basis for the reestablishment of such a relationship. The future will relate to what added extent the hospital's role can be better expressed in fulfilling community health needs in partnership with government.

### INFLATION IS THE WORST KIND OF TAXATION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed, as I am sure most of our colleagues are, over the tax and spending impasse that now exists between the Congress and the administration. I fear that if this deadlock continues we will seriously endanger the economy by our failure to act upon the most important issue now pending before Congress: The President's proposal for a temporary 10-percent surcharge for individual and corporate taxpayers.

I regret very much that this pressing issue is no longer being considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Although I recognize the need for extended, exhaustive deliberations on the vital question of whether taxes should be increased, I am of the opinion that the dialog between the administration and the Ways and Means Committee should not have been halted.

I recognize, as well as anyone else, the need for economy in Government. With the growing deficit, I am in complete agreement with advocates of spending cuts. But I do not believe that the question of economy in Government is the same question of whether Congress should increase taxes.

Let me say at the outset that I am disturbed that Members of Congress should suggest that the President make the spending cuts. It has always been the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to control expenditures, and the attempt by some Members of this body to "pass the buck" to the President sets a dangerous precedent. The Constitution is quite definite about where the power over expenditures reside. Article I, section 9, states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations

made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

This constitutional prerogative should be jealously guarded by the Congress. This prerogative should not be transferred to any President—for any reason.

As I see it, Congress has been given the power to stop, start, or reduce any program recommended by the President—either when the authorization of the program is being considered, or before or after it is proposed to spend the money in the form of an appropriations bill.

Therefore, the real issue at this juncture over spending cuts, I submit, is not whether Congress or the President makes the reductions. It is rather whether the Congress will properly and promptly assume its obligation and responsibility to do the job.

The distinctive feature of the congressional phase of the budget process in this country, as we all know, is that expenditures and taxes are considered separately and are the concern of different committees. The job of the Ways and Means Committee is to recommend to us, the Members of the House, the important question of whether and how much taxes should be raised or lowered to meet the Nation's revenue needs. And the equally important job of recommending to us the level of Government expenditures is that of the Appropriations Committee. In both cases, it is then up to us in this House to make the ultimate determination.

I have the highest regard and respect for the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee. It is a proud and independent panel, and rightly so, for it has earned the respect of the Nation for more than a century of initiating tax policy.

However, I do believe that the question of economy in Government is not the same question of whether taxes or revenues should be increased. Admittedly revenues and expenditures are very closely linked. Once the Congress has acted and the money lawfully appropriated, the Ways and Means Committee has no right to veto the expenditures. Only the full Congress may do that.

I do not believe that the tax writing or the appropriations committee should try to determine policy in the other's area of jurisdiction. Such action could potentially stymie the will of the majority of the Members of this House.

Admittedly, criticism in recent years from various quarters has been leveled at the fact that this division of responsibilities allows no consideration of the administration's revenue and expenditure budget as a unified proposal. The critics may be absolutely correct.

Nevertheless, a division exists between the House Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee on revenue and expenditure matters under House rules. If these rules are in need of a change, then let us entertain a motion to change them. Otherwise, it would seem to me that we must seek a better arrangement that assures greater harmony in the jurisdictional operations of these two great committees so that each can fulfill its own obligations and its own responsibilities.

Why am I today speaking in favor of resolving the spending and tax impasse and resuming consideration of the needed 10-percent surcharge proposal? Let me say that I feel compelled to speak out because of my abiding concern for the health of our economy, which, to be sure, all Members of Congress share.

It has been made abundantly clear from the President's August 3 tax message and from congressional testimony that the Nation cannot cope with the size of the deficit now in prospect, largely because of Vietnam costs, unless taxes are increased. Without higher taxes, the health of our economy—and the economic health of the citizens of every State in the Nation—will be seriously impaired. Inflation will result, eroding the living standards of many, and robbing those on fixed and falling incomes. Interest rates also will rise, making credit purchases, whether for consumer goods, cars, or homes, much more costly.

Another problem which will confront us without a tax increase is, undoubtedly, a worsening in our balance of payments, the excess of dollars spent abroad over dollars earned here. Our international balance of payments has been in deficit since 1953. Inflation that would result without a surcharge would cripple efforts to correct the payments deficit. It would add to the price of our exports, and make cheaper imports more attractive, thus aggravating our payments picture.

There is no question that passage of a tax bill will make a big difference in the economic life of this country, domestically, internationally, and in terms of the average American's pocketbook. The surcharge, in short, will cost him less in the long run than rising prices and interest rates which are in prospect without the small, additional, temporary tax.

To illustrate, let us examine what the surcharge, inflation, and higher interest rates mean in terms of the pocketbook of an average American family with two children and an income of \$7,500. This family for 1966 paid an income tax of about \$686 a year. The surtax proposal in 1968, during its first full year, would add \$70 to their tax bill, or about \$5.83 per month. Let us now examine what the cost will be to this average family if there is a jump in consumer prices because of the inflation which will come about if a tax surcharge is not enacted into law. Last year, prices, as measured by the Labor Department's consumer price index, rose 3.3 percent, up from 1965's increase of 1.7 percent. Many economists believe that year-to-year jump will be nothing compared with what might happen without the surcharge. Economists have estimated that the upsurge in prices next year might be 5 percent or more.

To be on the conservative side, let us assume that the prices next year rise 4 percent more than they otherwise would have. This will mean that \$100 of consumer purchases—food, clothes, and appliances, will cost \$104. If our average family spends one-third of its \$7,500 income, or some \$2,500 for purchases of consumers goods, it would cost them



\$2,600 with the 4 percent increase in prices. This means an additional monthly cost to our average family of \$8.33, compared with the added cost I referred to earlier of \$5.83 per month which would result from the surcharge. This is but one clear-cut example of how an average family would be better off with the surcharge than with inflation. In fact, the surcharge would save the family money—about \$30 a year—if you compare the total yearly cost of the surcharge with the cost of inflationary price increases.

Another good example of why our average family would be better off with the surcharge than without it can be illustrated if they were to buy a new home. As I stated before, heavy borrowings by Government to finance the estimated \$29 billion budget deficit would drive interest rates up for the prospective buyer of a new home, automobile, a major appliance, or wherever credit may be used for a purchase. Here is what would happen in the case of our average family's purchase of a new home costing \$20,000. Let us assume that they make a down payment in cash of 10 percent, or \$2,000, and get a first mortgage of \$18,000 for 30 years in duration. The average interest rate now for a home mortgage is about 6.5 percent, which would amount to \$113.77 in monthly payments of principal and interest. If the tax proposal is not enacted into law, the resulting upward pressures on interest rates could drive mortgage rates up 1 or 1.5 percent, perhaps even more. Under such circumstances, our average family would find that a 7½-percent interest rate would cost them \$125.86 in monthly payments of principal and interest, or \$132.08 in such costs if the rate went to 8 percent. It is clear to see from this that our average family could be paying anywhere from \$12.09 to \$18.31 per month more for their new \$20,000 house than they would have been with the surcharge. As I mentioned before, the increased cost to the family from the surcharge would be only about \$5.83 per month.

When the increased cost which would be incurred by the purchase of the new house is combined with the increased cost of consumers goods which our average family would have to bear, the cost of inflation, which the proposed surcharge would curb, becomes even more dramatic. The combined cost of higher prices and higher home mortgage interest rates—a 7½-percent rate—would be \$20.42 per month, nearly four times as much as the \$5.83 per month surcharge our average family would have to pay. The total yearly cost would be \$245.04, as contrasted to the \$70 surcharge.

In other words, the economists tell us that without the surcharge our average family will be forced to spend approximately \$175 more next year as a direct result of inflation and higher interest rates. In this light, the additional surcharge of \$70 becomes a very small price to pay to ward off even more costly inflation and high interest rates. Thus, I can only conclude that the only prudent act for the Congress to take is to enact the President's surcharge proposal forthwith. The surcharge is in the best inter-

est of the Nation's economy, and perhaps more important, it is in the best interests of our constituents who are the consumers and who are the families who will be purchasing homes in the coming year.

The impact is even greater on the family paying no income tax or so little that there will be little or no increase in taxes until the surtax is enacted. Without the surtax paid by those who can afford it, every family will be taxed with the increased cost of family necessities caused by the inflation which must be curbed.

#### OUR VANISHING CONSTITUTION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the following article by Noble George W. Nilsson, 33°, K.T., which appeared in a recent issue of the *Al Malaikhan*. In these days of demonstrations and the hue and cry of "our rights" by various groups, I feel that it is time we take stock and see just what has happened to our rapidly vanishing Constitution.

I commend to my colleagues, and to all readers of the RECORD, the following article:

#### OUR VANISHING CONSTITUTION

(By Noble George W. Nilsson, 33°, K.T.)

A few days ago, on July 4th, we celebrated the 191st Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. That document is the introduction to, and contains some of the fundamental principles upon which our Constitution is based. It should be studied very carefully, because many of the evil charges against George III in the Declaration of Independence are still with us.

The Declaration of Independence in five places refers to "Deity." It cannot be too often emphasized that the foundations of our Constitution and Republic are a belief in a Creator (GOD); individual liberty and local self-government.

Thomas Jefferson said:

"The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time. Can the liberty of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"

In a few days, on September 17th, we will celebrate the 180th Anniversary of the completion and signing of that document, which was adopted by the people in 1788.

How long has it been since you have read and studied that document? It is important that you do so NOW if we are to keep its principles. We may keep the form of the Constitution with our individual rights obliterated.

As the text for this essay, I quote from the funeral oration delivered by Pericles, the Athenian orator and statesman, in the year 430 B.C., for the young Athenians who had died during the first Peloponnesian War:

"I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country until you become filled with the love of her; and, when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

What are you doing to "... preserve, pro-

tect and defend the Constitution of The United States"?

#### I. CONDITIONS DURING 1775 TO 1791

Have you thought about conditions on July 4, 1776? No roads; no electric lights; no automobiles. Everything was primitive according to present standards, but—

The people believed in fundamental principles, and had convictions, so they fought for those principles.

At the time of the American War for Independence and the adoption of our Constitution there were 13 States along the Atlantic seaboard; with a population of approximately 3 millions.

You remember that the Declaration of Independence was written after the War for Independence started at the battle of Lexington and Concord in 1775. Brother George Washington was given command the same year.

The war lasted eight years, from 1775 to 1783. Defeat after defeat, and such disheartening experiences as the winter at Valley Forge.

1783 to 1787 was a critical period; quarrels between States; rebellion; chaos; almost anarchy.

The Constitution was signed September 17, 1787. It was adopted in 1788, and the Government began to function March 4, 1789.

The Bill of Rights, the first 10 Amendments, became effective December 15, 1791.

Note this carefully: In spite of war, numerous emergencies and the many problems confronting them, the people of the United States in 1787 and 1788 still feared a central government which might become too strong, and therefore they placed in the Constitution a great many checks and balances, and granted only limited power to the central government. They would not ratify the Constitution until guaranteed a Bill of Rights.

In contrast to the sixteen years, 1775 to 1791, now there are 50 States; our population is more than 190 million people.

Since the citizens of the 13 original States, in spite of war and chaos, insisted that their Constitution contain checks, balances, constitutional limitations and a Bill of Rights, surely with such a great multitude of Americans citizens in our day, with wealth and every material facility and luxury, "We, the People" should have the integrity and courage to insist that these checks, balances and constitutional limitations be maintained, and that they not be destroyed or diminished by the centralization of power in Washington.

Thomas Jefferson warned what well might happen if we fail. He said:

"Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction."

"To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specifically drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

#### II. THE MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the United States was hammered out in a convention as a result of more than three (3) months of debate by a group of statesmen who have been considered the finest group that ever met at one time. They knew exactly what each word meant that was put into the Constitution.

Later the document was submitted to the people of the 13 States for ratification. Again the document was argued thoroughly in each of the States over a period of months. In order to secure ratification, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and to some extent, John Jay, during the year 1788 wrote 85 essays which have been gathered together in a book entitled "The Federalist Papers." These essays thoroughly explain the Constitution, and we might say, were the advertise-

ments which sold the Constitution to the people of the United States.

Under these circumstances, how can any sound American contend that today the Constitution should have a meaning different from the clear language of the Constitution?

Is any present member of the Supreme Court of the United States equal to any of the members of the Constitutional Convention, so as to permit him to decide that he knows better what the Constitution means than men who were in the Convention and helped to write the Constitution?

Were all the lawyers, judges and statesmen who had anything to do with the Constitution for more than 150 years less learned than the modern lawyers, judges and statesmen who have been "revising" the meaning of the Constitution for some years?

The Constitution is a statement of principles. Principles do not change, even though the affairs or events to which they apply may have changed. In other words, the Constitution should be read as written. If any explanation is needed turn to the *Federalist Papers*, written at the time of debate, by those who helped to prepare and ratify it.

### III. CHECKS AND BALANCES

The members to the Constitution Convention of 1787 wrote into the Constitution checks and balances and division of powers with the object that there should be no centralization of power and that no dictator could ever take over.

Only limited power was granted to the Federal Government. This is clearly explained in the *Federalist Papers*. See especially Paper No. 45 where James Madison says:

"The powers delegated by the proposed constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State Governments are numerous and indefinite."

Then in *Federalist Paper No. 41* James Madison clearly enumerates and explains the limited powers of the Federal Government.

Here is a summary of the checks and balances:

1. The people are sovereign. The Constitution of the United States begins with "We, the People" and so does the Constitution of every one of the fifty States. To further prove and safeguard sovereignty of the people, the Ninth and Tenth Amendments were adopted.

2. As stated by James Madison, the States will handle the matters not given to the Federal Government.

3. The Federal Government was divided into three departments. This separation of powers is fully explained in Article XXX of the Bill of Rights adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in October of 1780. Note that this was adopted in spite of the reverses of the Army during that year. That article reads as follows:

"XXX. In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men."

Unfortunately, during the last 80 years too much power has been relinquished by the people and the States to the Federal Government, and in Washington too much power has been concentrated in the Executive Department, and now the Judicial Department has taken up legislation. This will be discussed more later.

### IV. MORAL LEADERSHIP IS NECESSARY TO RETURN TO LAW AND ORDER

It would be very pleasant to review the Constitution as we used to do years ago as the greatest instrument of its kind ever produced and discuss all of the good things that we enjoy under it. Unfortunately, however,

this pleasant exercise we cannot continue because there are many problems and the individual rights of the people under the Constitution are in greater danger now than they have been at any time since the Constitution was adopted.

de Montessuile said, in his great book "The Spirit of Laws," (Book 8):

"The deterioration of any government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded."

Our country cannot be destroyed from abroad. It can only be destroyed from within. This was pointed out by Abraham Lincoln in an address delivered at Springfield, Illinois, on January 27, 1837, entitled "The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions."

He said:

"At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

As a youth I used to read books written by George A. Henty, all of which had to do with young men who went into military service in various countries. One book is entitled "The Young Carthaginian." This has to do with the war between Carthage and Rome, by which Rome conquered Carthage. Here is his analysis between character and weakness:

"It seems to be the fate of all nations that as they grow in wealth so they lose their manly virtues. With wealth comes corruption, indolence, a reluctance to make sacrifices, and a weakening of the feeling of patriotism. Power falls into the hands of the ignorant many. Instead of the destinies of the country being swayed by the wisest and best, a fickle multitude, swayed by interested demagogues, assumes the direction of affairs, and the result is inevitable—wasted powers, gross mismanagement, final ruin."

Then he contrasts it with Rome:

"Rome, on the contrary, young and vigorous, was a people of warriors. Every one of her citizens who was capable of bearing arms was a soldier. The manly virtues were held in the highest esteem, and the sordid love of wealth had not as yet enfeebled her strength or sapped her powers. Her citizens were men, indeed, ready to make any sacrifice for their country; and such being the case, her final victory over Carthage was a matter of certainty."

A few hundred years later Rome followed Carthage into oblivion.

The burning of the American flag, the burning of draft cards, and riots in our universities would seem to indicate that the vigor of many of the American people has deteriorated.

Dr. Will Durant, assisted by his wife, has been engaged for more than 20 years writing "The Story of Civilization." Volume III of the set is entitled "Caesar and Christ," and covers the history of Rome. Here is what is said on pages 664 and 668:

"The two great problems of history are (1) how to account for the rise of Rome and (2) how to account for her fall."

"A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself within. The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her falling trade, her bureaucratic despotism, her stifling taxes, her consuming wars."

"The political causes of decay were rooted in one fact—that increasing despotism destroyed the citizen's civic sense, and dried up statesmanship at its source."

There are plenty of signs of decay in the United States: increase of crime (refer to F.B.I. uniform crime reports); juvenile delinquency; immorality—in books, motion pictures, as well as among individuals; increase of bureaucrats and centralization of power with resulting loss of self-government and individual liberty.

The newspapers for months have been full of reports about disrespect for law and order at universities and elsewhere. Just a few weeks ago there were riots at beach resorts during Easter—a Holy Day.

What about the Fifth Commandment? "Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

What about family and school discipline? In a recent magazine article it was stated that the Chinese District in New York City was the most law abiding. Why? Because the family was still intact.

Too often lately young delinquents particularly are excused on the theory that they are not responsible because their delinquencies are due to society or because of a difficult childhood, etc. This country grew up on the principles that each person had personal liberty and that he also had personal responsibility. One of the first rules I learned in law school was that a man was responsible for the natural consequences of his acts.

Here is a simple fundamental rule stated by Past-President Eisenhower: "Here we were, a poor family who didn't know we were poor. We lived on the wrong side of the tracks yet we had everything that counts. We have love and discipline and proper moral guidance, and the priceless opportunities that our kind of democracy offers its youth—the opportunity of education and the opportunity to rise above humble beginnings."

The outstanding success of General Eisenhower from humble beginnings, and the success of millions of other Americans from similar humble beginnings, is clear proof of the effectiveness of the foregoing simple rule.

Let's get back to personal responsibility as well as individual liberty.

### UNCHECKED AND UNBALANCED

In contrast to the checks and balances written into the Constitution, it now seems that many of these checks and balances have been and are ignored so that we may say that we now have a system which is unchecked and unbalanced. For instance, individuals, instead of standing on their own feet and being responsible for their own acts, turn to the Government for assistance.

Instead of local self-government, cities, counties and states figuratively go with "hat in hand" to Washington to receive Federal money. After all, this is not money of the Federal Government—it is money which has been collected from the people in the various States. Then instead of the separation of the three departments, we find the following situations.

### ABDICATING BY CONGRESS

Article I of the Constitution of the United States, Section 1, reads as follows:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Note it says all legislative power.

Therefore, neither the Executive Department nor the Judicial Department has any right to legislate. Nevertheless, it has become the custom of the Executive Department to prepare bills and give them to Congress to pass, and many times, the Congress has been only a rubber stamp. As a matter of fact, the practice is still in vogue because from time to time I receive reports on hearings on proposed legislation and find that the Committee is holding hearings on bills sent to the Congress by the Executive Department.

A book was published in 1934 entitled "The Challenge of Liberty." It was written by



the late distinguished patriot and former President, Herbert Hoover. At page 125 he said:

"The greatest shock of Regimentation, Fascism, Socialism, and Communism is upon Representative Government.

"The encroachments upon our liberties may not be overt—by repeal of any of the Constitutional guarantees—but they may be insidious and no less potent through encroachment upon the checks and balances which make its security. More particularly does the weakening of the legislative arm lead to encroachment by the executive upon the legislative and judicial functions, and inevitably that encroachment is upon individual liberty."

And at page 126 he said:

"It is in the legislative halls that Liberty commits suicide, although legislative bodies usually succeed in maintaining their forms. For 200 years the Roman Senate continued as a scene of social distinction and noisy prattle after it had surrendered its responsibilities and the Roman State had become a tyranny."

The Herald Examiner here in Los Angeles, published a series of three articles under the heading "A New Constitution Crisis," written by E. F. Tompkins. The first one, published on September 17, 1966, was entitled "Abdications by Congress." The second one, published September 24, 1966, was entitled "Executive Encroachments," and the third one, published on October 1, 1966, was entitled "Judicial Usurpation."

#### EXECUTIVE USURPATION

As has been pointed out, the executive department is intruding on the Legislative branch.

Also, employees of various Administrative Tribunals go beyond or ignore provisions of the laws they are supposed to administer.

#### ARE PUBLIC OFFICIALS OUR SERVANTS OR MASTERS?

Justice Brandeis, in his dissenting opinion in *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 478, said in part:

"The makers of the Constitution . . . sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the government, (their own government) the right to be let alone—the most Comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."

We are supposed to have a government of laws, not of men. Unfortunately, now bureaucrats often do as they please. To illustrate:

#### FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 104(a) (6) was inserted because the officials in Washington were interfering with social organizations, such as fraternities. The Section reads as follows:

"(6) Nothing in this or any other Act shall be construed as authorizing the Commission, its Advisory Committees, or any person under its supervision or control to inquire into or investigate any membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, any college or university fraternity or sorority, any private club or any religious organization."

#### PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Masons are directly interested in maintaining public schools. Educationists seek federal control of schools through federal aid.

This can be accomplished only by ignoring the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

Perhaps these individuals mean well, but Justice Brandeis warned us against "dogooders." Referring again to his dissenting opinion in *Olmstead v. U.S.*, he said in part:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the govern-

ment's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

From time to time the statement is made from Washington that the Federal Government will not interfere with the running of local schools. However, the employees of that Department do interfere.

For instance, in 1961 the United States Bureau of Education issued a pamphlet in which it showed how it would interfere with preparing the curricula, etc. in local schools. It even went so far as to say Unesco would help to prepare the curricula for local American schools.

To make it clear that there should be no such interference, Congress inserted Section 604 in the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10. It reads:

"Federal Control of Education Prohibited. "Sec. 604. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional material by any educational institution or school system."

Section 804 was added to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329):

(a) Prohibiting Federal control of Education;

(b) Prohibiting interference with sororities, fraternities, etc., financed privately.

In spite of this specific prohibition, the United States Commissioner of Education is advocating a number of projects in local schools which certainly are not within the scope of the Federal Government, such as moving city children from city schools to suburban schools and children from suburban schools to city schools. (Read article in "United States News and World Report" issue of February 27, 1967, page 68.)

If we cannot take care of our schools locally, then we must admit we cannot govern ourselves.

Are you ready to admit that?

#### JUDICIAL USURPATION

The third of the series of articles published by the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner referred to above, was entitled "Judicial Usurpation." Many Americans, both lawyers and laymen, feel that the Supreme Court of the United States often goes beyond its judicial duties and is actually legislating.

In 1958 Judge Learned Hand, one of the great judges and legal minds of our age, delivered three lectures at Harvard Law School on the subject "The Bill of Rights." His three lectures have been published by Harvard University Press under the title "The Bill of Rights." At page 42 Judge Hand says:

"Such definition leaves no alternative to regarding the Court as a third legislative chamber."

At page 55 of the book, he again refers to the Court as "a third legislative chamber."

Justice Felix Frankfurter, a great constitutional lawyer, dissented in the case of *Baker v. Carr*, a case decided in March, 1962. This was the first case which the Supreme Court interfered with reappointment by the States. Justice Frankfurter pointed out that the Supreme Court for more than 100 years had refused to pass on apportionment matters because they were political actions which belonged to the States or Congress. He also pointed out that only five years previously, the current court had thus ruled.

Many of the opinions of the Supreme Court, which I believe are improper, are de-

cided by five Justices, with four Justices dissenting.

On May 29, 1967, five Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the Constitutional Amendment adopted by the people of California by a vote of 4,526,460 to 2,395,747 was unconstitutional. This was known as Proposition 13, and after adoption by the people it became Article 26 of the California Constitution.

This means that five Justices can overcome the right and votes of "We, the People" to amend our State Constitution. Five Justices against 4,526,460 citizens of the State of California who adopted a constitutional amendment after a thorough argument of the proposition before the people.

Is this what our Constitution means? What is left of the rights of "We, the People" who adopted the Constitution of the United States, and then further insisted for their own protection on adoption of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments?

Most of you have heard a statement credited to Confucius on the subject of judicial usurpation. He said:

"Detest the magistrate who is wiser than the law, setting in its place his own notion of right."

#### CONCLUSION

Our problem is dramatically presented in the last two paragraphs of a book "Freedom and Federalism" by Felix Morley:

"When Caesar stood on the banks of the Rubicon, deciding whether or not to strike down the sadly corrupted Roman Republic, he argued to himself that the issue was really already settled. 'It is nothing,' he said, 'to be a republic, now a mere name without substance or character.'"

"If that is the way we have come to feel about federalism, then is our Republic also, in less than two centuries of history, on the way out."

What must we do to return to principles and re-establish our Constitution?

1. Read, re-read and study the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

2. In September take part in the Constitution observance at your Lodge. If you do not belong to a California Lodge, attend some Lodge. There will be joint meetings such as one which will be held in the new Scottish Rite Temple on Wilshire Boulevard.

3. When you read papers or magazines about proposed legislation, either at Sacramento or Washington, compare it with the Constitution to see if the proposed legislation conforms to the Constitution.

The time for action is now!

Sir Winston Churchill pointed out that procrastination could be fatal. He said:

"If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival . . . There may be even a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

Either we are free and must exercise our responsibility as citizens or ultimately become slaves.

"We, the People" are the sovereign power. Let each of us resume our individual responsibilities so as to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution" and thus retain our individual rights and self-government.

"For what avail the plough or sail, or land—or life itself—if freedom fail?" ("Boston" 1873—Ralph Waldo Emerson.)

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted to recommit the resolution for a continuing appropriation and I voted against the resolution in final passage.

I strongly disapprove of the House action on this bill and I do not believe it was in this body's best tradition of responsible government. I understand the zeal that many of the Members have to cut the budget. I do not, however, regard this bill as the appropriate vehicle for those cuts, nor do I approve of the haphazard fashion in which they were voted.

This body has highly developed procedures for cutting appropriations. There is no reason why they cannot be followed.

What the House did on this bill was to slash indiscriminately. Surely, as men of judgment, we must recognize that some programs have a higher priority than others, that some cuts can be made with less damage to important undertakings than others. I would be in no position to object if those who are anxious to cut the budget studied carefully the programs they want to reduce, then put their proposals before us. Such a procedure was not followed. What we encountered was an emotional expression in behalf of budget cutting, not the careful deliberation that this process requires. I hope that when this bill is returned to us, after consideration by the Senate, it will receive the scrupulous care that it deserves.

#### COMMONS DEBATES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the United States and Canadian Interparliamentary Group, I have long watched closely the debate in the Canadian House of Commons about the role of the United States in Vietnam.

Because Canada has been a loyal friend and staunch ally through the years, I believe that their discussions have great importance for us in the United States. I have been impressed by the high level of responsibility shown in these debates. Frequently, the American press will point up the very few areas of disagreement between our two Governments while neglecting their clear recognition of our shared heritage and common purpose.

For this reason, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a portion of the debate of October 12, 1967. It is my belief, based on many trips to Canada with the Interparliamentary Group and the many conversations I have had with

legislators there, that the Honorable F. J. Bigg is voicing an opinion held by many Canadians. Mr. Bigg lays before his fellow Members of the House of Commons a sober view of world problems and a most gracious and relevant discussion of the career of President Johnson.

At a time when many unfriendly words are being quoted about this administration from citizens of other lands, I feel that it is very useful for my colleagues in the House and for the American people to have an opportunity to ponder the perceptive and understanding remarks of our fellow legislator in Canada, the distinguished and very able F. J. Bigg.

Excerpts from the debate follow:

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca). Mr. Speaker, we have a great many problems at home in Canada today which I should like to discuss if I had the time. However, there is a problem abroad which far transcends all our domestic problems. I refer to the deplorable fact that most of the people of Canada are being systematically brainwashed. I am not accusing the present administration of having a hand in this, apart from the contribution they make because of ineptitude. I give this administration full credit for meaning well. Nevertheless this ineptitude on the part of those in positions of responsibility to this house and the nation makes it evident that they are guilty of serious neglect.

Although I am not an expert on foreign affairs I intend to take a few minutes of the time of the house to attempt to outline what is so obvious to me as a layman and novice in foreign affairs. A true picture of the international situation is not being presented to us. We have an enemy in this world, international communism and I am in no way hesitant about saying that. These people have friends in this country, although as I have said before I do not think any of them sit in this house.

The Canadian war crimes tribunal organization which seeks to put President Johnson of the United States on trial for his so-called war crimes is allowed to operate. Free discussion in Canada has always been our prerogative and I would be the last to suggest that a person does not have the right to say what he wants as long as he is willing to accept the responsibility involved. Having regard to the anti-United States propaganda to which this country has been subjected, I have waited in vain for a clear voice from the fourth estate, from the television and radio media, yes even from responsible members of the government and of this house, to give what I consider a fair and balanced picture of the situation.

(5:30 p.m.)

It is passing strange that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the North Vietnamese and the soul of the Viet Cong, should always be given the benefit of the doubt and favourable publicity. I have in my hand a paper which clearly indicates in straight, factual terms, Mr. Ho Chi Minh's record. I think it would be fair, and perhaps interesting, to know in chronological order what have been the actions of Ho Chi Minh during the last 47 years and what have been the actions of one Lyndon B. Johnson, who bears the responsibility both militarily and politically for maintaining the freedom of at least the western world, and in Viet Nam certainly some semblance of freedom amongst the small nations of Asia.

On December 25, 1920, Ho Chi Minh, a Viet Nam born Chinese, became a member of the Marxist wing of the French socialist party while attending the party conference in Paris. Lyndon B. Johnson was at this time attending high school in Johnson City, Texas. He

had the same kind of background as most of us in the house have enjoyed. He was raised on a farm and received a western-style free education.

Lyndon B. Johnson found it necessary to work with his hands and learned that he needed energy and individual effort in order to finish his schooling. Ho Chi Minh was educated at the expense of the international socialist party. In 1923 Ho Chi Minh became the editor of *Le Paria*, a French communist publication, and received one year's training in Moscow. In December, 1924, he was sent to Canton, China, as interpreter for the communist Michael Borodin. At that time Lyndon B. Johnson was graduating from high school as president of his class and had already achieved a reputation as a debater.

At that time President Johnson did not know of his rendezvous with fate. He did not know that he would one day be President of the United States. In fact, he scorned higher education. He was a young, energetic man who went out looking for work, which was not easy for an untrained man to find even in those days. It was difficult for him to find suitable work to which he could devote his great talents. Therefore Lyndon B. Johnson wandered about the United States working with his hands. He graduated from the school of hard knocks. Lyndon B. Johnson recognized that education was necessary for all young people and he went back to school.

In January, 1930 we find that under Ho Chi Minh's leadership a conference was held in Hong Kong with Chinese communists to integrate three Vietnamese communist parties, the Oriental Communist Party, the Annamese Communist Party and the Oriental Communist League. These became the communist party of Indo-China, a branch of the Third International of Moscow, and it so remained until 1940.

Let us go back to our friend Lyndon B. Johnson. He enrolled at Southwest Texas Teachers State College and became a school teacher. He was a school teacher for a year. He then continued his studies at college, obtained a degree and took up public speaking. He was just a nice, friendly school teacher. In 1931 Lyndon B. Johnson, having a great interest in politics even from his early years, became secretary to a congressman. Mr. Hoover was the Republican president. From his early days Lyndon B. Johnson was liberal with a small "l".

In 1932 Lyndon B. Johnson attached himself to Mr. Roosevelt's administration and worked unceasingly for the New Deal. I think the most rabid of critics of that program cannot say that the New Deal was anything but a tremendous attempt to maintain the dignity of the individual and the right of little people to share in the great wealth and progress of North America.

On May 19, 1941, Moscow disbanded the Third Communist International. The Vietnamese communist party established the Doc Lap Dong-Minh, or the Viet Minh, to wage guerrilla warfare. They went underground. Who was the spiritual leader of this group? It was Ho Chi Minh. In 1940 Viet Nam, together with most other southeast Asian countries, was occupied by Japan. At the end of the eastern theatre of world war II the power of the United States was ascending. Ho Chi Minh at this time continued his program of the march of communism.

Where was Lyndon B. Johnson at this time? He is a man who has always thought for himself. He heeded United States' public opinion and came out flatly for entering world war II on the side of the free nations. In 1941 England stood alone. Lyndon B. Johnson, who has always been a very strong nationalist, came out flatly in favour of his country fighting with Britain. He said that the United States needed the draft and he worked toward that end. Mr. Johnson was the kind of man who did not only talk but acted. He stood for principles. He promised



the young men of the United States, on the day he voted for conscription to send America's young blood to fight for freedom, that he would be with them. Less than three hours after he put his name to the draft bill Lyndon B. Johnson joined the United States navy. He worked in the theatre of war in which Ho Chi Minh was working underground with the communists.

President Johnson, as he now is, served as a volunteer lieutenant in the United States navy. His short term of service in the Pacific was exciting. His courage was rewarded by being decorated by his country. The president of that day, believing that Lyndon B. Johnson and his ability to organize the war effort were of more use in Washington, ordered him back for duty.

(5:40 p.m.)

On August 15, 1945 Japan surrendered to the allies. On August 17 and 18, 1945 an uprising was provoked in Hanoi. On August 19, 1945 Ho Chi Minh launched his take-over. On September 2, 1945 Ho Chi Minh established his regime in Hanoi, ousting Bao Dai, the former emperor of Annam. Where was Lyndon B. Johnson at that time?

Mr. BIGG. In 1945 Mr. Johnson ran for the United States senate. In the senate, until the time he became president, he fought for all those things which leftists talk about and do nothing about and which he himself backed whenever it meant that the strength of the strong should be used to help the poor. There was no segment of society, however small and neglected, that President Johnson did not support, and this has been affirmed by minority groups such as the one composed of Germans in his own state during world war II and the negro minority. During his term in the senate he instituted and pushed with all his might for reforms which it had taken 82 years to put on the statute books of the United States.

I had hoped in the 20 minutes allotted to me to present the full record of this man but it would take hours to review in detail the accomplishments of this great president. I am sick and tired of hearing criticisms of the noble efforts made by President Johnson himself to bring peace to Viet Nam and the noble efforts made by the American people and their sons to continue the fighting. I think we should level criticism whenever we can if we think an injustice is being done, and the point I am trying to make this afternoon is that an injustice is done when those who feel the way I do not give lip service at least to our American friends and allies.

A partisan politician would say it is better to support his party no matter how bad it is than to support the other party no matter how good it is. That has never been the style of Lyndon B. Johnson. He has always had the courage to stand up against those things in which he did not believe and he is exceptionally good at getting things done. I believe that Ho Chi Minh is also exceptionally good at getting things done that he wants done, but as I read the reports of his achievements I find they are all negative and all designed to destroy freedom. However, as I read the record of Lyndon B. Johnson's career I find that for the last 35 years at least he has only had one end in mind, to uphold the dignity of the human being. Because he lives in an imperfect world and can only work through political organizations, imperfect as they are, and because it is difficult even for the Americans who use restraint to achieve peace and security in our world, it is beneath our dignity to sit here in smug security north of the line and have nothing but bad to say about those who are at least doing their best.

Attempts are being made to force us to talk about dollars and cents and not to talk about things on a high plane. I can do that. I think the Canadian people should pay 10 per cent of the cost of freedom along with

the Americans, I go further and say, as I said in 1939, that more than our money should be at stake. President Johnson thought his life was at stake. He thought that strongly about the matter and I do not think he has changed. But I do think we should change.

(5:50 p.m.)

Some may sit here quietly, accept things as they are and say, "We know all that, Bigg, why don't you sit down?" If these facts are known, I do not hear about them. I read the newspapers daily and I listen to the news broadcasts. One would really think President Johnson was the leader of some kind of international gang. It is for this reason I ask hon. members to consider these facts. They are in every "Who's Who." When I am doing my homework, my desk is piled high with papers containing these facts. These articles were not written by President Johnson's friends. As I said before, President Johnson is a liberal with a small "l", while I am a conservative with a small "c". However, like President Johnson, when the welfare of my country is at stake I have no politics. I have seen these very issues kicked around, even on the floor of this house, for cheap political reasons, and I do not point my finger at the Liberals when I say that. We on this side of the house are condemned by our own silence as well as by interpreting the remarks by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), who is seized with the responsibility of giving us the whole truth, nothing but the truth.

I am not afraid of the truth. It has been said many times that the truth will make one free. If we are only going to be given half truths, then I say half truths will lead to slavery. It will be the same kind of slavery that President Johnson has spent his whole life fighting. He has risked his political career fighting it. Slavery is not dead in the United States. President Johnson knows that, as do many other people in the United States. However, it is not politically wise to stand up and say so because down there feelings run high. Thank God, we do not have it in this country.

Some parliamentarians from England were visiting us last week. They said that our prospects are greater than our problems. If we take the attitude that the war in Viet Nam is none of our business, then we should at least keep quiet about those who think they have a stake in it and think they are doing their best. If we have a better alternative, then what is it? Ho Chi Minh is represented as a man who is working for the self-determination of people. Well, there are a lot of people in South Viet Nam as well as in North Viet Nam. If this man Johnson wanted to use all the power he has to stop the war, we know only too well how quickly that war could be stopped. We also know at what cost. Here is a man who is not going to use all the power he has for cheap political purposes.

I wanted to go through his record to indicate that while Ho Chi Minh was busy undermining the small nations of Southeast Asia President Johnson was quietly doing his duty. Since President Kennedy is dead, it is safe to make him a hero. However, since President Johnson is still alive he can still be used for cheap political purposes. I say it is time we in Canada cut it out. This man was chosen by President Kennedy. Kennedy said of him, this man is even more fit to serve the American people than I am. When Kennedy got the opportunity to sit in high places he knew that he needed the wisdom and dedication of this man Johnson to help him guide the United States through very difficult times.

I, for one, thank God we have a man of Johnson's calibre as our neighbour. I fear no invasion from the south. President Johnson has always supported the United Nations. He has done all he could to make the United Nations effective. President Johnson has offered to give up his right to decide these

issues if the United Nations is willing and able to deal with them. When he has made these suggestions he has been turned down. The facts are here and we all know them. Less than 18 months ago the United States did stop the bombing for six weeks. What has happened to the memories of those men who write this propaganda we are getting? What did North Viet Nam do? They methodically and coldbloodedly built up their military strength. More United States soldiers died because this man Johnson was reasonable enough to give North Viet Nam every opportunity.

There are many nations in the world today in which both sides of this story will not be told. The iron curtain encircles them. There is only one press and only one party in those countries. I thank God again that here we have two parties. If a man is delinquent or is interpreted as not telling us the truth, then it is my plain duty to ask the truth. I am not afraid the people of Canada will condemn me for that. I put freedom above all other things, and it is the truth that will make us free.

#### FEDERAL GRANTS FOR STAFFING OF OFFICIAL STATE AND LOCAL HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSIONS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide Federal grants to help staff official State and local human relations commissions.

The solution to race relations problems—through the achievement of equal opportunity for all, and the creation of understanding between the races—is among the most crucial items on the agenda at every level of government in America today. It occupies the attention of every agency of the Federal Government, and of State, county, and municipal officials throughout the Nation.

The Justice Department's community relations service was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide communities with Federal help in coping with disputes, disagreements, and difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based upon race, color, or national origin. One of the community relations service's jobs is to answer requests for help in setting up or improving local human relations commissions. In CRS's view—

These organizations potentially are one of the most hopeful ways that communities can work effectively on problems in race relations.

Human relations commissions provide the machinery for dealing with the problems of racial discrimination in a democratic framework.

There are currently 69 cities and six counties with professionally staffed human relations or community relations commissions—both terms are used interchangeably. Human relations commissions also exist in some 35 States.

A large number of these commissions



are public agencies—that is, they were established by State or local ordinances. Their very establishment as an arm of public policy signifies that the community is concerned about and committed to peaceful methods of resolving differences among its citizens.

The most successful of these agencies have two other common characteristics:

First. The commissioners are respected community leaders and representatives of leading racial, religious, business, labor and civic groups; and

Second. The commission has specific responsibilities and goals set out in the establishing ordinance or mayor's executive order.

The job of the human relations commission is twofold. In those States and localities with a local ordinance banning discrimination in employment, education, public accommodations, and other areas, the human relations commission may be assigned the responsibility for administering the ordinance. This is the role of the Baltimore Community Relations Commission, originally established by a 1956 city ordinance as an equal employment opportunity commission, and given a broader title and responsibilities when the mayor signed an antidiscrimination ordinance in 1964.

The second commission role is to facilitate orderly social change by opening up channels of communication between groups, setting up procedures for the airing of grievances and relieving of tensions, mediating disputes when they do arise, and providing leadership in recognizing and solving potential problem areas before they boil over.

The existence of a paid, professional staff—and public appropriated funds to pay them with—often make the difference between a successful, permanent human relations commission, and a weak, short-lived one. In its guide to the formation of effective commissions, the Justice Department's CRS has said:

A commission without an adequate staff is seriously handicapped in its efforts to serve the community in the field of human relations.

Experience throughout the country—

Says the National Association of Inter-group Relations Officials—NAIRO—shows a very high mortality rate for city committees without staff, as compared with those which have staff.

One of the most serious operational difficulties that human relations commissions face today as they attempt to deal with the No. 1 priority problem in American society is a serious shortage of staff.

The problem is serious because commission staff are so busy putting out fires of racial disharmony after they are lit, that they are unable to spend sufficient time on the creation of racial understanding which is their long-range goal.

If a commission is to be successful, its staff members must develop contacts and relationships within the community they are serving. Insufficient staff also precludes the opening of neighborhood offices to deal with problems where they arise.

Moreover, according to NAIRO Execu-

tive Director Frederick Routh, there is no State agency with regulatory powers that does not have a serious backlog of claim cases before it.

The career of compliance officer is a relatively new one, having come into existence chiefly after the passage of numerous civil rights laws in the early 1960's. A compliance officer is a key man in any agency with regulatory powers, because he is responsible for the administration of antidiscrimination laws. Regardless of a college graduate's major, he is a beginner in compliance when he joins a human relations commission. Only 2 years of on-the-job training will produce a good compliance officer.

But the field of human relations work is so new, the number of experienced people in the field so small, and the salaries offered so low, that no sooner does the staff person gain experience than he leaves for a better job at higher pay in another city. It is not only a public or private agency at the city, State, or Federal level which recruits the human relations commission staff member. Human relations work is so low paying, that a good person with several years' experience is also offered higher salaries by other—and equally community service oriented—professions, such as urban development.

Even at the beginning level, the human relations commission offers little employment incentive. In many cities, the starting salary for an inexperienced compliance officer is less than the beginning salary for a teacher or welfare worker. Because competent people cannot be attracted at the lowest levels, there are not enough replacements for higher level people who are attracted elsewhere, and for the new posts being created every day.

In the last year alone, according to a U.S. Conference of Mayors survey, 48 persons were added to city and county community relations commission staffs, bringing the total number of staff to 527 in 69 cities and six counties surveyed. Despite the fact that 36 of these commissions increased their annual budgets in the same year, the mean staff size is still only three.

The bill I have introduced today is designed to provide Federal help to official State and local human relations agencies to help them tackle this urgent nationwide emergency by providing funds to develop leadership on the local level. It will strengthen those human relations commissions which are already staffed, and serve as an incentive to encourage the contribution of local funds toward the staffing of the 200 commissions which still do not have permanent personnel.

My bill amends title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which established the Federal community relations service. Under this legislation, the Attorney General would be authorized to make grants to State and local public agencies and organizations engaged in programs designed to resolve disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color or national origin. The money would be used for the employment of necessary staff, and the

acquisition, furnishing and procurement of necessary administrative support services—including office space, supplies and equipment, and travel expenses—for such agencies and organizations.

The bill also contains a provision designed to insure that Federal aid will supplement and encourage local contributions to human relations agencies, and will in no case supplant such funds.

Finally, a sum of \$3 million is authorized for the first year of the program.

The suggestion for this legislation was originally made to me by David Glenn, the talented young director of the Baltimore Community Relations Commission. I would like to include as part of my statement Mr. Glenn's letter describing the problems he and human relations directors throughout the country are facing today.

I would welcome the support of my colleagues and their cosponsorship of this legislation to strengthen the capacity of local governments to deal with race relations problems.

The letter referred to follows:

BALTIMORE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION,

Baltimore, Md., July 27, 1967.

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: At the end of our meeting with the Mayor several weeks ago, you requested that I correspond with you relative to my suggestion that the Federal government assume some of the responsibility for staffing and otherwise subsidizing local human relations commissions such as our own. I am bold enough to make this suggestion for two reasons.

First of all, I think that recent events in urban centers throughout the country indicate that the Federal government not only has a responsibility but also a role to play in alleviating, or setting up machinery to alleviate, the problems which have caused the disorders which are now sweeping the country. Most of the local commissions which have enforcement powers administer laws which are basically adequate to cope with the problems which need attention. If local commissions have any problem with respect to administering local laws, it is that these commissions do not have adequate staff to deploy on the various problems—specifically employment and community organization—which deserve maximum attention under present conditions. I am aware of the fact that the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have contacts and programs, to a limited degree, in the major urban centers; however, these agencies, operating out of Washington, can never hope to be as effective as the local agencies which administer local laws, and which have intimate knowledge of the problems in the areas they serve.

Second, it seems to me that, where the enforcement of Federal law is concerned (Civil Rights Act of 1964, etc.), the local agencies might be able to secure greater compliance than is now achieved through various Federal agencies with headquarters in Washington and regional offices around the country.

Thus, I return to my original point, namely, that the Federal government has a role to play, and that some kind of program and/or formula for assisting local human relations commissions in a realistic way should be immediately devised. When I say realistic, I obviously am talking in terms of dollars and cents, since I believe that these commissions can only be effective if they have proper



staff capable of "zeroing-in" on the multitude of problems which come within their purview. I think that the amount of money involved—while substantial in terms of the resources of local communities—would not be too great a burden for the Federal government, particularly in view of the potential benefits which would accrue to the local communities as well as the Federal government. Certainly, one of the side results of such an effort by the Federal government would be the possibility of getting a greater commitment to human relations commissions from cities which now have them; and, also the possibility of having those communities, which do not presently have such commission, develop such agencies in their own locales.

If you feel that my suggestion has any merit whatsoever, I would be more than happy to sit down with you, and any others whom you would wish to include, to discuss ways in which this idea might be effectuated.

I appreciated having an opportunity to meet with you and the other members of the Congressional delegation, and I look forward to getting together with you again in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID L. GLENN,  
Director.

### EGYPTIANS ATTACK ISRAEL SHIP "ELATH"

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the attack by Egypt on the Israel ship *Elath* is a deplorable act of aggression. This and the renewed fighting which is reported today is obvious evidence of the unwillingness of Nasser and his henchmen to live in a peaceful world side by side with the nation of Israel.

It really matters not who fired the first shot today, and there are conflicting reports from the scene of battle. The aggressive act which renewed the tragic fighting was the attack by Egypt on the Israel ship *Elath*.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped the fighting was over. Obviously, this was wishful thinking. I urge our Government to take whatever steps are necessary through the appropriate forums to see that this latest Egyptian aggression is not a profitable venture for them. A peaceful state of affairs, rather than continued strife, must prevail in this troubled area of the world.

### GI QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANSWERS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as we read the newspapers and listen to the radio and television commentators, we are constantly bombarded with what seem to be unanswerable questions on

taxes, inflation, poverty, rural problems, urban problems, ad infinitum. All of these are important, but I wonder how much thought is given by the average American citizen to the "unanswered question" which must be on the mind of every American serviceman, Just how much thought is given by our citizenry to the sacrifices they are making every day?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent column written by my friend, Walter Kaner, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press. I wish every American could read it, and I commend it to your attention:

#### GI QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANSWERS (By Walter Kaner)

He was just a kid.  
A babyfaced kid with a crew cut. He looked too young to be a soldier.

But among the ribbons he wore on his uniform was a Purple Heart for the chunk of mortar shell that ripped his leg in Vietnam.

When I last saw him two years ago his world was baseball, football, dates and souped up jalopies.

Now, he looked older and sadder and his eyes seemed aged by the sight of death and pain and suffering.

And I realize he wasn't a kid anymore. As we were having dinner in a restaurant crowded with people drinking, laughing and dining, he asked: "Does anybody know there's a war on?"

He didn't wait for an answer. "Isn't it everybody's war? If it's a war for us—Isn't it a war for everybody?"

He gazed at the crowded, noisy bar. "Nothing's changed here. Over there, guys are getting killed. Here? Everybody's busy chasing a buck. Watching TV. Going to ball games. To restaurants."

His voice didn't sound angry or bitter, but hurt. "Some of the guys would turn over in their graves if they knew . . . if they could see what's going on here. If a guy dies fighting for his country . . . it's gotta count . . . it's gotta mean something. If you ask a guy to sacrifice his life for his country . . . shouldn't the people back home sacrifice something too?"

I didn't answer. Because I couldn't find the words.

He lit a cigarette, then gripped his drink so tight his knuckles turned white. "Aren't you going to ask me, like everybody else, what it's like over there?"

Again, he didn't wait for my reply. "I'll tell you. It's a dirty, rotten stinking war. The bugs, the heat, the rain, the mud and the stinking swamps drive you nuts."

"And you're scared. Damn scared. Because any minute you're liable to get your head blown off or your guts ripped out."

He toyed with, but didn't touch his food. "Funny," he smiled a hollow sort of smile. "I remember the day I went in the Army. You joke and you tell your folks not to worry and how you'll be home soon and everything's going to be OK. But inside you're worried and scared and you wonder to yourself if you're really coming back and if you'll ever see your folks and the house and the old neighborhood again."

"The first couple of weeks are the toughest. You're so lonely and homesick you hurt inside. Sometimes, when you're trying to sleep, you cry a little. But you write letters home telling your folks not to worry and how great everything is and inside you ache something awful."

I groped for something to say. I heard myself saying: "How'd you like to go to a nightclub?" He shrugged and nodded.

As we drove over the Queensboro Bridge he turned on the radio as a newscaster was saying: "Red troops ripped into the rear

platoon of a U.S. Marine company with withering small arms and machinegun fire eight miles southwest of Quang Tri City. Ten Marines were killed and 19 wounded."

He cursed, snapped off the radio and stared silently out the window. Finally he said: "Do you know what it's like to visit the folks of one of your buddies who was killed?"

He lit a cigarette. "What do you say to them? You mumble about what a great guy he was, and how brave he was, and how he died for his country and how they should be proud of him."

"Then you leave, and you look at the people who really don't know there's a war, and you want to smash your fist through a wall."

As we entered the night club and sat down at a table, he stared solemnly at the jam-packed room and the couples dancing the Twist. At the next table a woman was saying: "So for the party Saturday, I found this divine dress . . ." And from a nearby table a well dressed man could be heard remarking: "I made so much this year, I can't take any stock profits . . ."

The kid stared grimly at his drink. The show started. Pretty dancing girls in scanty costumes, a shapely singer, a comic with fast gags. The kid watched disinterestedly. His thought seemed thousands of miles away.

Mid-way through the show he turned to me asking: "Wait, do you mind if we leave?"

As I drove him home he turned to me asking: "How do you think the guys feel when they hear about the draft card burners? And the hippies who aren't in the Army? And that antiwar demonstration in Washington yesterday? Mad! Damn mad."

And I kept thinking of the kid's painful question:

"Doesn't anybody know there's a war on?"

### THE MAYOR OF WASHINGTON, OR WHAT'S IN A NAME

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some objection in the Congress to the popular and journalistic custom of calling the chief executive of the District of Columbia "Mayor" Walter Washington instead of using his technically correct title of District Commissioner. This surely must be one of the more minor issues facing the Congress, but I thought the Members might like to read why the Washington Star prefers Mayor Washington:

#### MR. MAYOR

In a letter the other day one of our readers asked a good question: Why, all of a sudden, is everyone going along with this business of calling Walter Washington the new mayor when his real title is District Commissioner?

There is no mystery about how it started, or why. The President began using the term, rather pointedly, at Washington's oath of office ceremony three weeks ago. He has taken every opportunity to use it since. He obviously wants it to take hold. And the reason is that "mayor" makes the District sound more like other cities. It implies that through the Johnson reorganization plan the new District head has been vested with powers which would be quite impossible if he were merely a "commissioner."

None of which is really true, and no one, of course, should be taken in by this political ploy. So why are we being taken in?

Well, we might, weaving and dodging, note

that Webster does define "mayor" as the "chief executive officer of a municipal corporation," which Walter Washington certainly is. Or that mayors, in some cities, are in fact appointed rather than elected. Or even that Walter Washington, after all, needs all the prestige just now that he can muster by any means.

But the simple truth is that we are persuaded by a consideration of purely personal convenience: the word "commissioner," to put it bluntly, just doesn't fit in headlines. "Mayor" fits fine.

It used to be that we got around this dilemma by using names such as Tobriner, Duncan or Mathe. But "Washington," let's face it, counts nearly as long in the copy book as "commissioner." Besides, the person is apt to be confused with the city. And we've never been one of those who call people FDR or LBJ—so WW is out.

Mayor, it is. Our copy readers are overjoyed. You should get better headlines. And so long as no one is deceived, what's the harm?

### CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 15, 1967, the Italo-American groups of the city of Garfield, with appropriate ceremonies, unveiled a statue honoring Christopher Columbus, the explorer who first saw the Western Hemisphere and recorded it for posterity.

This 14-foot monument, depicting Columbus as a navigator, stands in the beautiful surroundings of Columbus Park, Outwater Lane, and Midland Avenue; and was erected by Unico, a national Italo-American group.

Taking part in the unveiling ceremonies were several hundred persons, many of them members of Garfield's Italo-American societies; the Garfield Knights of Columbus; Unico president, Joseph Comino; Vincent Rigolosi, mayor of Garfield; and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include the text of the speech which I made at this unveiling ceremony:

#### CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I wish to express to you my deepest appreciation for inviting me here today to participate in the dedication of this statue to the honor and glory of a brave Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Lord Macaulay, the eminent English historian, once wrote: "Italian civilization, nearly 3,000 years old, has never faded out. The nights which have descended on Italy have been nights of Arctic summer, the dawn always reappearing before the reflection of the preceding sunset has faded from the horizon."

And, indeed, this judgment is a sound one, proclaiming to the world the debt which all of the Western civilization owes to Italy—that Nation which Virgil believed destined by the Gods to greatness.

On this occasion, in the dedication of this statue, we remember the name and the achievement of one of history's few indi-

viduals whose actions substantially altered the progress of human development. That man is Christopher Columbus. It would be superfluous to recount here his accomplishment—so much more than the mere distinction of doing first a task whose fulfillment was inevitable. The place which Columbus holds in history is owing to his extraordinary determination to defy the strictures of unfruitful convention, and to persist in pursuit of an ideal whose worth he believed. In short, Columbus was one of those rare men in history who have acted in a way wholly consistent with their convictions.

I think that on an occasion such as this it is proper for us to pay tribute not only to Columbus the man, but also to the heritage he so gloriously fulfilled—the heritage of Italy, his native land. For Columbus stands, in the eyes of posterity, as a symbol, the perfect example of all that has been productive, affirmative, and innovative in the Italian character.

A statue, such as we are dedicating here today, is a monument to a moment in the lives of a people. It pays tribute, constant and visible, throughout the years, to some noble achievement of these people and their Nation.

It is important to remember that the influence of Italy upon America began with the discovery by Columbus of this New World. It is significant that this influence has never ceased to act as a positive and fruitful force upon the progress of our Republic.

The history of this Nation bears proof to my claims, and vindicates the tribute we give today. It has become a cliché to note that some of the finest words in the Declaration of Independence were inspired by an Italian—by Filippo Mazzei, friend and confidante of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. Italians were prominent members of the New York, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia colonies before Revolution had ever been broached. After Revolution had been accomplished, Italians were instrumental in winning the frontier country. Colonel Francesco Vigo, a scout, spy, and banker—contributed immeasurably to winning the Northwest Territory. Italians have fought in large numbers in every war waged by America in the defense of liberty; nearly one million men of Italian extraction served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II.

Not only in defense of the Nation have Italians offered valuable service. Consider the area of art: Constantino Brumidi, known as the "Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," and Carlo Franzoni, who sculpted the famous Car of History in our Capitol's Statuary Hall, this famous sculpture is also known as the Franzoni clock. Both of these Italian artisans have left their indelible and imperishable marks on this our National symbol of Unity.

Consider Saint Francis Xavier Cabrini—the first and only United States citizen to be canonized as a Saint. As founder of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, she demonstrated a compassion and a spirituality indicative of Italian religious devotion and sound moral awareness.

Consider music: Italians like Toscanini, Caruso, Tebaldi, and Michelangelo have enriched the American cultural sphere beyond measure.

And in the art of science; you think immediately of Enrico Fermi, the developer of the atomic energy reactor.

And, when we consider entertainment; who does not know the names of Perry Como or Jimmy Durante?

Although there are many Italians in the political field, the great immortal of politics is Fiorello LaGuardia—the "Little Flower"—deeply enshrined as a permanent fixture of American political history.

Let no voice discredit this amazing Italian

navigator of ingenuity and dedication. His indefatigable efforts were motivated by two clear purposes. He had a religious dedication. He wanted to propagate the Christian faith in Asia and convert the Grand Khan. He wished to rescue the holy sepulcher of Jerusalem from the Moslems. He had also an explorer's dedication. He wanted to reach the far continents believed to be Asia. Attempts have been made to diminish the importance of his role in the discovery of America. Let these documented facts speak for themselves. Let every Italian-American stand in the proud glory of this historic day of October 12, 1492.

To give further glory to Christopher Columbus, the Congress has before it many bills which would make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Just a little over a week ago, a sub-committee of the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee held hearings on establishing such a national holiday. I have introduced legislation to this effect and have supported the proposal before the sub-committee.

We should recognize the fact that it is an official holiday in 36 states and this alone should be persuasive reasoning why the United States should enact a law making it a nationwide observance.

The sole justification for making it a national holiday is to pay tribute to the discovery of America. October 12th is the birthdate of the Western Hemisphere. It is a date which commemorates the opening of the Western Hemisphere to the countries of Europe.

There are many arguments as to who arrived in America first. Whether the Norsemen where here first, whether Lief Erikson did in fact come here, whether the Irish were here ahead of others, all of this is immaterial to the essential point. It was the coming of Columbus to America and his landing here on October 12, 1492, which opened the New World to the Old World.

Through the gate he opened to the West 475 years ago, there has flowed an ever-widening stream of freedom-seeking humanity. Those who came in his wake can read a nation's creed which he could never have written:

"Give me your tired, your poor—  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed  
to me:  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These are the words taken from the base of the Statue of Liberty, so proudly standing in New York harbor.

Now, let us dedicate this statue to a noble Italian, in gratitude for the contributions made by the sons and daughters of Italy—the spiritual heirs of Columbus—to the United States of America. May this dedication ceremony, the unveiling of this statue, serve as a visible expression of our respect for the land which gave birth to Columbus and inspired so much that is good in our civilization.

### REVITALIZING THE SCHOOLS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to set forth in the RECORD at this point the address made by Hon. Wilbur J. Cohen,



Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the Queens opening dinner of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, held at the International Hotel, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, Long Island, N.Y., on Monday evening, October 23.

We are most grateful to Under Secretary Cohen for accepting the invitation to be the guest speaker at the kickoff dinner for the federation campaign in Queens County, and we hereby once again publicly express our appreciation to him for fitting this speaking engagement into his very busy schedule.

The speech follows:

#### REVITALIZING THE SCHOOLS

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I am very pleased and honored to participate in the 50th Golden Anniversary of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. One of the most unique characteristics of Americans in their generosity in giving time, money and energy in voluntary efforts to help create a better life for their neighbors and community. Your organization can take pride in its efforts to make the United States a better place to live.

As President Johnson stated in his message on Education and Health to the Congress last year: "A nation's greatness is measured by its concern for the health and welfare of its people. Throughout the history of our democracy, this concern has grown and deepened."

This concern with the well being of people has been evident in the growth of your organization.

Ever since the founding of this Nation, private generosity has pioneered the great social advances. For example, the bitter battle for free public education in this country was led by religious and charitable organizations. Even after the battle was won, private organizations continued to pioneer in new directions in education. For example, private generosity stimulated:

The establishment of normal schools for teachers.

Schools for the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded neglect schools.

Kindergartens and summer schools.

And of course, higher education in the United States was founded and has been encouraged by the philanthropy of many Americans.

Private support of great social causes has often stimulated governmental action when it was needed. And generally, governmental activity has not replaced but stimulated more private support for social programs. The American people have indicated that they want a better life for all and they are willing to contribute more through both taxes and private giving to attain the goal.

Actually it was not until 1917, fifty years ago, an anniversary coinciding with the initiation of your organization, that the Federal Government became directly involved in education. Although the Government has always had an interest in education, dating back to the Northwest Ordinance of Jefferson's term thru the Morrill Act of 1862, providing Federal assistance for vocational training under the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, was the real beginning of Federal support for education. Since that time, of course, support has grown—notably in the past three years, where it became increasingly clear that Federal help is required to maintain and improve the quality of education. The unprecedented expansion in educational activities had to be paralleled by an unprecedented degree of support for education from the Federal Government. With States and local communities devoting 37

percent of their expenditures to their schools, there was no other way.

Today about 56 million students are enrolled in schools and colleges in the United States. That's more than one-fourth of the nation's population. About 2 million men and women are now teaching in our grade and high schools and almost half-a-million more in our colleges and universities. The importance that Americans place in education is reflected in the growing sums of money spent for that purpose. Expenditures for education will reach about \$49 billion this year—or about 6½ percent of the Gross National Product. Spending for education by all levels of government has increased dramatically from \$13 billion in 1956 to \$34 billion in 1966; and most of the funds come consistently from State and local government sources. However, in the last two years, the Federal share has increased from 12 percent to 16 percent of the total.

The importance that Americans place on education is also reflected in private spending. Since 1955 the amount spent has nearly tripled, due mainly to investments in higher education. In 1955, the private sector was investing \$1.3 billion higher education. By 1966, the outlay was about \$3.5 billion.

But in spite of these growing, public and private investments, we are still far from solving the serious, complex problems of American Education. Dramatic social, economic and technological changes, characterized by population growth, urbanization, growing wealth and production and the rising expectations on the part of all citizens to share in this prosperity, but tremendous demands on the educational system. Educators must accommodate growing numbers of students. Educators must provide better education and more educational opportunities for all who seek them and they must reach out to large minority groups who have been ignored in the past. The system must adapt to the changing role and meaning of education, and the services it provides must reach upward, downward and throughout the whole age range of our population. It must foster and provide life-long learning opportunities and become oriented to leisure time and cultural pursuits. And it must become increasingly involved in the affairs of the local and worldwide community. Education must become a vital process of innovation and interaction—for the student, the teacher, the parent, the educational institution, the community and the nation.

The growing sum of money spent for education is helping the system meet some of the demands thrust upon it. But money alone, although we do need more, will not solve all the problems nor guarantee attainment of the goals we have set for education—to foster individual fulfillment and to nurture the free, rational responsible men and women without whom our kind of society cannot endure.

We want to improve the distressingly poor education provided in most low income areas. We want to overcome early educational handicaps of deprived children. We want to upgrade teaching staff. We want to prepare young people for a world of work which will be considerably different than the one today.

Right now we are educating children who will be making their living in the year 2000 and after—just think of the implication! These are tasks which cannot be left to the educators alone. Parents, school board members, local officials and responsible citizens must help in this difficult and exacting job of redesigning the school to meet today's and tomorrow's demands. This job is going to take a vast expenditure of imagination, energy and money.

Although new Federal funds give schools the leverage to work on vital national challenges to education, the Federal Government does not assume day-to-day financial support of schools. That is the job of the

States and localities. And it is up to the citizens of the community to institute the changes they want made in the schools. Working through the PTA, citizen action groups and your own organization, with other organizations, you can influence the decisions that are made on education in your community.

Most of our cities' schools are in trouble in numerous ways—economically, socially, and culturally. Let me give you a few examples of the great unmet needs of our schools today.

Without any change in the present teacher pupil ratio—increasing elementary and secondary school enrollments will require an additional 7,000–8,000 teachers a year. By 1972, 90,000 additional teachers will be needed.

Teacher's salaries range from \$4,650, to over \$8,000 with the national average \$6,820. An increase in the salaries of elementary and secondary school teachers is necessary to attract and hold capable imaginative and enthusiastic individuals as teachers of the Nation's youth. Over \$2 billion annually would be needed to raise the national average to \$8,100 (the California and New York average).

One out of ten school age children in the United States has a mental or physical handicapped condition that requires special educational attention. At present, there are only 60,000 teachers and other professional personnel available in the field of education of handicapped children. By 1973, more than 300,000 teachers and other personnel will be needed. At a cost of \$5,400 per person, \$150 million would be required to train the required number of personnel to meet the educational needs of handicapped children.

As a result of accommodating the post-war baby boom in classrooms our school districts are faced with a rapid increase in bond indebtedness and serious neglect of the needs for replacement modernization, and expansion of obsolete facilities. To relieve overcrowded and unsafe public elementary and secondary school classrooms today, the United States needs 382,000 classrooms at an estimated cost of nearly \$15 billion.

Almost 50 percent of the Nation's elementary school children attend schools without libraries or with substandard libraries. About one billion dollars would be needed to bring school library book collections up to standards.

Quality pre-school opportunities are necessary for disadvantaged children if they are ever to have the hope of succeeding in regular classroom situations. Yet only 710,000 of the 2 million children aged 3–5 from poor families received preschool training last year in Head Start programs. To expand the program to remedy the background deficiencies of 2 million children would cost \$405 million a year.

About 2 million school children between the age of 6 and 15 are underachievers and need compensatory education. The present \$1.4 billion programs are reaching only about one-fourth of these children.

Approximately 80 percent of the students enrolled in the 5th grade of elementary school will not complete a 4-year degree program; more than 1 million students a year do not complete high school. By 1972, an estimated 18 million individuals will be in need of vocational education, but only 11.4 million will be enrolled in current programs unless new ways are found to meet the special needs of disadvantaged youth and school dropouts.

These are just a few examples taken from a voluminous list of great unmet needs of the schools. However, they can give you some idea of the scope and magnitude of the problems.

Now these problems are not going to be solved by pushing a button or putting a coin in the machine. They can only be solved by



a coordinated, intensive effort of herculean magnitude and the effective use of the Nation's resources. And we are going to have to tap every available source for new and imaginative ideas. Every conceivable group, public and private will have to work together if we are going to beat the crisis in education and revitalize our schools so that they can do the job the Nation requires. I urge you with other groups in your community to explore new ideas, encourage research and experimental programs and help bring about the adoption of proven innovations in the school room.

It is a truism that the way to excellence in education is research which leads to innovation and then into generally applied practice. But the United States has lagged in applying this principle to education. While financial support for educational research and development has increased in the past few years as the result of Federal legislation, the amount is still small when compared with spending by other basic industries. Less than one-half of one percent of the Nation's total outlay for education is spent on research and development, compared with ten percent of total outlay in other major industries—nearly 60 times as much, for example, is spent on defense research.

Not only is the amount and quality of research in education low, but there is relatively little feedback—even from good research—to the local school system. Unpublished innovations—however, successful in experimental application—are far too often not adopted simply because they are unknown. Others are not adopted because most school systems are run by such antiquated managerial methods that they are literally unable to change—to accept and adopt new ideas and techniques.

The results of research in education are too long delayed in application, or lost. It has been estimated that overall there is a 30-year lag between development of an innovation in education and its widespread adoption. It is 15 years before three percent of the school districts have made the change. Twenty regional educational laboratories established under Federal legislation in 1965 are designed to close this gap by speeding up the dissemination of research findings and putting research results in operation. The Laboratory operating here in New York, under the leadership of Robert Dentler is doing an excellent job of closing this gap. The world is moving too rapidly to wait 30 years for a good idea to be put into practice.

But what can you and your organization do to help bridge this gap and to meet other needs of the schools? Work with your local school board. Help them modernize and streamline their operations. But get involved. Most of you here tonight have knowledge and skills to contribute to the task—accountants, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, social workers—there isn't a profession today that could not contribute to the gigantic effort that must be undertaken.

Financial problems plague practically every city school system. Since the forties and fifties, city schools get proportionately less State aid than suburban schools. A recent study of 35 cities shows that the cities' average was \$125 per pupil in State aid last year, while suburban districts got an average of \$165 per student—\$40 more.

These imbalances arise from excessive reliance on one factor to determine the allocation of funds: the number of dollars of assessed value behind each student in the district. I think we are going to have to rely more heavily on sources of revenue other than the property tax which is an inflexible source of funds.

In general, cities have to spend a greater proportion of their income on nonschool services than suburban areas. Last year, the cities spent an average of 65 percent of their local tax dollars on nonschool services—police and

fire protection, garbage collection—many services that benefit not only their own residents but the commuters who use the services daily without adequately paying for them. The suburban areas spent about 35 percent of their revenues for this purpose.

While the demands on the cities' services are increasing, the tax base is decreasing as the exodus of business and workers to the suburbs continues. Thus, the money available to the city schools is decreasing while the need for more money is increasing and the problems in the school become more critical.

Some States are beginning to adjust their tax distribution pattern so that the cities will be treated more equitably. Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania for example, have made encouraging progress.

But further steps will have to be taken because in spite of these adjustments. Money for city schools is going to be in short supply for a long time. Thus we must continue to correct some of the imbalances in economics and we are going to have to make our dollars go farther.

This may mean coordinating programs, so that they serve a number of functions. It means seeing the school as an integral part of the community not as an isolated entity. It means that educators will have to learn how to communicate with the community and vice versa.

We will have to use every available resource not only for efficiency's sake but because a frank and mutual exchange of ideas among many diverse groups can be stimulating and provide new approaches that perhaps reliance on one group might not provide. For example, your organization, working with a local community action group, the PTA, and a local businessman's organization, might be able to devise a better program for school dropouts than the school could do alone.

There are a number of new ideas being discussed today. Some are very controversial, some are well accepted, and some may work in one city but not in another. But let us clear away some of the cobwebs in our thinking and try out a few of them.

Economically, socially and culturally it is advantageous to keep the schools open evenings, weekends and summer. We really cannot afford to close the school door at 3:00 p.m. everyday. For one reason it is a waste of valuable property. Isn't it more efficient and wouldn't it help to provide the answer to some of our problems, if the school was used as a community cultural center? It can serve the diversified and creative needs of the whole community. Why not introduce new courses that children and parents could participate in together in the evenings or on Saturdays. For example, some schools sponsor evening classes on family life instruction which mothers and daughters attend together. Another class is offered for sons and fathers on the subject.

This might be the first step in getting parents involved in the child's life as a student and in the school itself. Experience under Head Start programs has already proven the inherent benefits of parent involvement in the child's education. There must be a number of approaches to getting the parent involved in the child's education in the school. Parents must play a large role in school planning, school decisions and school operations and this means more than just PTA activities. It means a permanently established program in which parents become a part of the school structure in classroom activities, as teacher aides and not only as members of school boards.

Another idea you might explore is making space available in inner-city schools for commercial establishments such as grocery stores or beauty shops. This would be an excellent way to provide new services to the commu-

nity, part-time job opportunities for students and extra revenue for the school system.

You might also provide rent free space in the school for local craftsmen—artists, potters, silversmiths, with the provisions that they devote some of their time to teaching students.

Or perhaps your community may want a building that would integrate the school with retail stores, banks, offices and apartments.

You might want to develop a consortium for elementary and secondary schools like those developing on the college level. All schools could have open enrollment and a student could attend the school that best suited his needs and provided the course he was interested in.

Couldn't students be offered more alternatives to a rigid full time schedule where they are either in school or out of school? Some students have individual needs, interests and problems and often they have no other choice than to drop out of school. Couldn't we let them drop-in on a part-time basis? Couldn't we set up work study programs?

These are just a few suggestions of what might be done to help revitalize our schools. I think it is going to be one of the most difficult, but one of the most exciting tasks we will face in the next decade. But I am confident that if we all work together as members of public and private organizations and as interested and involved citizens, there will be dramatic improvements in education before the end of the decade.

It will take a vast expenditure of time, money, and effort but it can be done. It has to be done. "It is the first work of our time", as President Johnson has said. Our survival as a Nation is dependent on it.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMAN FORESAW THE UNITED NATIONS ROLE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as we recall the anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we might remember with gratitude the foresight of President Harry S. Truman who marked its first anniversary 21 years ago with a speech at the General Assembly's opening session in New York.

I include extracts of his address which is still pertinent today:

This meeting of the Assembly symbolizes the abandonment by the United States of a policy of isolation.

The overwhelming majority of the American people, regardless of party, support the United Nations.

Lately we have all heard talk about the possibility of another world war. Fears have been aroused all over the world.

I have been reading reports from many parts of the world. These reports all agree on one major point—the people of every nation are sick of war. They know its agony and its futility. No responsible government can ignore this universal feeling.

The United States of America has no wish to make war, now or in the future, upon any people anywhere in the world. The heart of our foreign policy is a sincere desire for peace. This nation will work patiently for peace by every means consistent with self-respect and security. Another world war



would shatter the hopes of mankind and completely destroy civilization as we know it.

Every member of the United Nations is legally and morally bound by the Charter to keep the peace. More specifically, every member is bound to refrain in its international relations from the threat, or use, of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

I remind you that 23 members of the United Nations have bound themselves by the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal to the principle that planning, initiating or waging a war of aggression is a crime against humanity for which individuals as well as states shall be tried before the bar of international justice.

The United States will support the United Nations with all the resources that we possess.

The course of history has made us one of the stronger nations of the world. It has therefore placed upon us special responsibilities to conserve our strength and to use it rightly in a world interdependent as our world today.

The American people recognize these special responsibilities. We shall do our best to meet them, both in the making of peace settlements and in the fulfillment of the long-range task of the United Nations.

The American people look upon the United Nations not as a temporary expedient but as a permanent partnership—a partnership among the peoples of the world for their common peace and common well-being.

It must be the determined purpose of all of us to see that the United Nations lives and grows in the minds and hearts of all people.

#### DICKEY-LINCOLN GIVES CONSUMER CHANCE FOR PRICE COMPETITION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the paradoxes of the consumer protection field that we who speak for the consumer must often do so by quoting the credo of private enterprise to our opponents.

We see this paradox in many ways: We ask grocery chains to compete in both price and services for the low-income consumer but there is often only a smile in reply. We ask drug companies to practice free enterprise by competing for low prices and elaborate excuses for high prices result. And we ask private power to understand the Northeast's interest in lower electric power rates through a commendable public power project which competes by price comparison and we find 100 reasons why monopolies are better.

The Dickey-Lincoln project will give the Northeast what every other segment of the country has already, a comparative base for electric power costs. Those who back this project think competition is good for all businesses. We wish that preachers of free enterprise would practice what they preach.

#### UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, throughout history wars have blemished the relations among men; yet throughout history mankind has sought peace. The United Nations has existed so long in our memories, that we sometimes tend to forget how exciting an experiment in peacemaking it is and how recent to man's history is the establishment of a permanent international peacemaking organization.

I had the honor of serving in the Senate to which the Charter of the United Nations was presented, and I am proud to say I was among those who strongly advocated U.S. participation in the United Nations. I wish I could convey to you the atmosphere in the legislative chambers of our Government during that momentous period when—with the deepest sense of responsibility to the people of this Nation and to the succeeding generations of Americans—the U.S. Senate deliberated on ratification of the United Nations Charter. On this day which has been designated United Nations Day, let us all pause to recall the fervor with which the war-stricken people of the entire world desired lasting peace, the idealism with which the Charter of the United Nations was imbued, and the efforts of the drafters of the charter to provide the machinery to implement those desires and idealism. Let us pause to reaffirm the support of the American people for the United Nations and our faith in the principles on which it was based.

We must recognize that the United Nations has not proven capable of fully obtaining for the people of the world those objectives for which it was designed, because the nations of the world have been unwilling to put the idealism expressed in the charter into practice. Despite the innumerable accomplishments of the United Nations in temporizing conflicts, restoring peace and order, providing to nations various alternative methods for peaceful settlement of disputes, despite its record of successes as an instrument for peace, the critics of the United Nations dwell on its weaknesses. The weaknesses of the United Nations, however, are largely due to the vast transformations of the state of world affairs which have taken place over the past two decades. When the charter was drafted the cold war had not yet been waged by our adversary, the nuclear age of fear had not begun. The United Nations has been forced to adapt to these changes. It is against this tableau of changes that the weaknesses and strengths of the United Nations must be measured. Such an evaluation will clearly show that the United Nations has repeatedly demonstrated its utility for peace, its durability in face of obstacles, its worth as a testing ground for international cooperation for world order—so new to the history of man.

We are indeed witnessing an exciting experiment in man's search for peace. On this United Nations Day, let us call on all the nations of the world to join with the American people in rededicating ourselves to the goals expressed in the United Nations Charter that one day we will have secured for succeeding generations a world in which, as it is so beautifully expressed in the Bible:

They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

#### A NEED TO REMOVE LIMITATIONS ON OCEAN CRUISES

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have been, for a long time, concerned with the need to provide an opportunity for U.S.-flag passenger vessels to operate profitably after their subsidy. To this end, I introduced H.R. 12630, a bill to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises. Today I was pleased and honored to appear before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in support of this legislation. I would like at this time to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my statement before that fine committee:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER BEFORE THE HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE REGARDING H.R. 12639 AND H.R. 13630, "TO REMOVE CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON OCEAN CRUISES," OCTOBER 24, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished Committee: I am pleased to appear before your Committee to support H.R. 12639, introduced by Chairman Garmatz, as well as a companion bill which I have introduced, H.R. 13630, which is identical to the Chairman's. In my opinion, this legislation is an extremely important piece of legislation, and I am honored also to add my name as a sponsor.

I believe in American-flag passenger vessels, and that the United States must have a fleet of modern passenger liners as an essential part of its Merchant Marine. But in order to have a viable fleet of American-flag passenger vessels, we must remove restrictions that presently hinder the operations of these vessels. Certainly the operators of American-flag passenger vessels must have the same operational flexibility that is enjoyed by companies operating foreign-flag vessels.

Removal of restrictions placed on US-flag vessels in connection with cruise operations is long past due. Under the so-called cruise legislation now in effect, the U.S.-flag vessels in the subsidized fleets are not permitted to engage in cruise operations for more than one-third of each year. Even after authority to make cruise voyages has been granted by the Maritime Board, there are several limitations which hamper operations and result in earnings which are less than could be secured from cruise business.

Among the restrictions which would be removed by H.R. 12639 is the portion of the year within which a vessel may engage in cruise business. Many US-flag vessels are not required for berth services for as much as two-

thirds of the year and under existing regulations must lie idle or make voyages which incur losses to the operators.

Another very important change would be removal of the requirement that passengers be embarked only at domestic ports on the same seacoast as that to which the vessel is assigned on regular services. In the future US-flag vessels engaged in cruise operations would be permitted to carry passengers round-trip or one-way between domestic and foreign and other domestic ports without diminution of subsidy, the only restriction being that they not carry passengers between ports regularly served by another US-flag passenger liner unless specifically authorized by the Board on findings that existing operator's service would not be adversely affected.

US-flag vessels are not able to engage in round-the-world cruises. Removal of this prohibition would allow greater US-flag participation in the growing round-the-world cruise traffic. Much of the business now goes to foreign-flag lines which operate without such restrictions. Participation in the round-the-world cruise business and greater freedom in other cruise voyages would result in greater utilization of liners and contribute to a strong merchant marine. Our national interests require that our merchant marine be as strong as possible.

There appears to be no reason for continuing to prohibit carrying mail and/or cargo aboard cruise vessels. H.R. 12639 would repeal this prohibition and permit cruise vessels to carry mail and/or cargo except between ports where other U.S.-flag vessels provide the service on their regular routes. Where authorized by the Board on finding such carriage would not adversely affect the existing operators' service, mail and/or cargo could be carried between ports where service already is being provided.

Because cruise operations would no longer be restricted to seacoasts on which the liner is authorized to operate, H.R. 12639 would repeal Section 613 (f) of the Merchant Marine Act, which defines seacoasts.

In view of the importance of the merchant marine to the nation, and the problems of maintaining merchant fleets adequate for our national purposes, these needless restrictions should be removed as soon as possible. The passenger vessel service which formerly was available along our coasts has disappeared. It is no longer possible for many people wishing to travel by ocean from one port in the country to another except in a few instances. Cruise ships sailing from the North Atlantic ports, if they were able to stop at intermediate ports, could tap a source of traffic in the tourists who would travel by ship to Miami, for example, when they would not be able to travel the entire cruise route. Also, tourists could join the cruise at Miami and travel to another port or continue for the entire cruise. A considerable volume of passenger traffic would be generated if the existing restrictions were removed as provided by H.R. 12639. This would redound to the benefit of the port areas as well as to the liner operators. Our US-flag operators must be allowed, in fact should be encouraged, to utilize their vessels to the best advantage and in full time voyages which would generate revenue rather than loss.

In my opinion, there is a great untapped market for passengers desiring one-way or round-trip ocean travel between U.S. North Atlantic ports and Florida and between U.S. Gulf ports and Florida. It is also paradoxical that one of the most attractive cruise markets, between Florida ports and Puerto Rico is presently unable to be served because of statutory restrictions.

In 1968, a permanent exposition, Interama, will open in Miami. In addition to the other well known features and attractions of the Miami and Florida area, this exposition will provide an excellent basis and point of in-

terest for passenger cruise operations. I have noted that twenty-two cruises carrying 10,652 passengers were operated between United States North Atlantic ports to Montreal in connection with Expo-67. Only seven of these cruises were by American-flag vessels. I am certain that cruises between United States North Atlantic ports and Miami would provide a much more attractive and significantly greater cruise market than cruises to Montreal. However, because of the restrictions in the present law, such cruises between United States North Atlantic ports and Miami by subsidized American-flag passenger vessels would be prohibited.

I urge your Committee to give H.R. 12639 your prompt and favorable consideration so that this desirable piece of proposed legislation may be enacted into law on the earliest possible date.

Thank you.

### SINKING OF THE "ELATH"

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath*, with the loss of some 51 Israel seamen, demonstrates beyond peradventure of a doubt which side in the Middle East stands for peace and which side stands for war.

We have heard a great deal of talk from various governments that Israel should withdraw to some earlier frontier, having no relation to its defense. The *Elath* incident points up how ridiculous that talk is.

As the Times of London says in an editorial:

Israel hoped for two things as a result of the war \* \* \* recognition of her existence by the Arabs and more defensible frontiers. If she cannot get the first, she will concentrate on the second and a new round of fighting is likely to lead to fresh territorial conquests by Israel.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the Arabs in their unprovoked attack on the *Elath* indicated they were spoiling for trouble. The incident cannot be overlooked. If the sovereign nations of the world cannot see to it that Israel is secure, then Israel must see to it herself.

To say the least, I am deeply disappointed by the attitude of our own Government to this act of unprovoked hostility. The State Department indicated that it finds the sinking "regrettable," but refused to criticize the Egyptians for it as if somehow both sides were equally to blame.

I regard this position by our Government as unfortunate.

For the United States, the act has particular significance, because it puts on display a powerful Soviet weapon, perhaps operated by Soviet technicians. Are we to let the Middle East be a proving ground for Soviet missiles and Israel be their target? I should hope that we shall not.

The situation in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker, is dangerous once again. It is time for this country to assert itself to

make certain there is no repetition which might touch off a general resumption of the fighting.

LT. COL. TERRY ALLEN, JR.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the death of every serviceman in Vietnam is a great personal tragedy to someone—sometimes to many, sometimes to just a few. But, occasionally the death of one man seems to capture the attention of the entire Nation, and to focus our thoughts anew on the challenge of the great war for freedom in which we are engaged.

When 58 brave young Americans gave their lives in a bitter battle northwest of Saigon last week, Lt. Col. Terry Allen, Jr., was a battalion commander of the 1st Infantry Division. He had been twice decorated for bravery in combat before he gave his life in last week's action. Both the name of Terry Allen and the unit, the 1st Infantry Division, were already legends in the field of U.S. military history.

Colonel Allen's father, Gen. Terry Allen, Sr., commanded the 1st Division, the Big Red 1, in its smash across North Africa in World War II. In peacetime, he was equally renowned as one of the Army's great polo players. Both father and son are products of my home city, El Paso, Tex. Both married into prominent pioneer El Paso families. The death of Colonel Allen, as you might expect, had a great personal impact on the people of El Paso. The El Paso Herald Post expressed, I believe, the feeling of our community in its editorial of Thursday, October 19, written by Robert Lee, which I would like to place in the Record at this point:

ONE OF MANY

The name of Terry Allen is a notable one in El Paso, for Major General Terry Allen of this city was an authentic hero of World War II, the much decorated commander of the Big Red One Division.

Thus it is that news of the death of another Terry Allen—son of General Allen and a lieutenant colonel and Battalion Commander of the Big Red One in Vietnam—is perhaps of more than ordinary interest.

Lieutenant Colonel Allen was a worthy son of a valiant father. He was twice decorated for heroism in recent months, and had established himself as an outstanding leader.

Yet, Lieutenant Colonel Allen was only one of many young men from El Paso and from many other sections of our nation, who have lost their lives in Vietnam. Their names represent a cross-section of America. No one death is more "important" than another—they are all terribly important to all of us.

Each life lost, whether it is that of a high ranking officer or a private, increases the strains already evident in our country, and adds to the clamor to "pull out" or "get it over with". To pull out would be to make a mockery of all these men have died for. To get it over with means more loss of lives.

We face an enemy with admittedly less financial resources than our own, and ad-



mittedly less power. Yet one virtue they possess—patience, or if you will, dogged determination. They count on this for victory. They count on our impatience to cause us to quit.

Lieutenant Colonel Allen and the thousands of others slain in Vietnam possessed the determination to win. The test is whether the rest of us possess the same.

#### REPRESENTATIVE MOSS ADDRESSES MONTANA FARMERS UNION CONVENTION

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, recently delivered an outstanding address at the annual convention of the Montana Farmers Union in Great Falls, Mont.

In it, he expressed views with which I strongly agree, and I recommend his thoughtful comments to every Member of the House.

I include Congressman Moss' remarks in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MONTANA FARMERS UNION, GREAT FALLS, MONT., OCTOBER 19, 1967:

It is very refreshing to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems facing the rural communities of your great and beautiful State of Montana.

I might add that it is refreshing as well to be away from the discords, pressures and bickerings which pervade our national capital today.

There are myriad critical problems besetting our Nation both at home and abroad. But their magnitude does not minimize the seriousness of the problems facing you right here in your own backyard. In fact, the worsening state of the nation's rural economy demands immediate and thorough study and corrective action.

The progressive National Farmers Union is in the forefront of a growing national campaign to remold and reinvigorate our rural economy, advancing new ideas and concrete proposals. In Montana, under the leadership of your long-time president Leonard Kenfield, you have worked diligently to preserve the best values of rural life in modern society. Each of you deserve the highest praise and the fullest cooperation of all thinking Americans.

In the last few years the spotlight of national concern has centered, for the most part, on the urban communities of America and their large pockets of grim and debilitating poverty. Certainly the problems of our cities cry out for speedy and effective solutions. And you will agree, I know, that we cannot evade our responsibilities in this regard.

While the plight of our rural economy has been somewhat obscured by the violence and upheaval in the cities, there is a growing awareness that America's rural communities and farmers also face complex and serious problems. There is indeed a close relationship between the urban and rural dilemmas now brooding over the nation.

The crisis in our cities is caused in large measure by the gross congestion of people which breeds economic instability, shocking

housing conditions, and explosive discontent. Many of the 30 million persons who migrated from American farms to American cities since 1940 were "rural dropouts" who left the farming communities because of the sagging rural economy. "There's no home on the farm," they said, "so let's try the city." And, I'm afraid, that despite the urban convulsions the mass migration to the cities is continuing.

It is a particularly sad and revealing fact that most of the people leaving the land for the cities are under thirty years of age. The largest group comprises young people who have just finished high school and are facing the productive years of life.

I know this figure is probably out of line in Montana, but one-third of the Americans who live on farms, live in poverty. In addition, the proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is among industrial workers. Furthermore, our rural communities, generally speaking, do not offer first rate medical facilities, maximum cultural opportunities, or a great variety of stores and services.

The flight to the cities also means fewer people to pay the taxes in rural areas, and thus less money for public education, public medical facilities, libraries, and other institutions which are the mark of social progress.

How can we stem, indeed reverse, this flow of manpower to the cities? The answer is obvious but mighty hard to come by—make our rural areas economically attractive and provide better homes, better roads, better schools, better amenities of all kinds. I agree fully with your President, Mr. Kenfield, who recently said:

"Rural America has vast spaces with clean air and is capable, if allowed to share in a larger part of the national income, of providing wholesome living for more families on more farms and in more rural communities."

A dynamic program of improvement in rural America will help the cities by relieving them of depressing congestion and shifting their burdens into more self-sustaining areas.

A recent Gallup poll tells us that half of the American people would really prefer to live in the country or in a small town, if they felt they could obtain the economic and social advantages of urban and suburban areas.

The challenge we face, then, is simply this: we must harness our technology and resources—which are the greatest in the world—to provide the benefits of modern living throughout our rural communities, benefits equal to or higher than those existing elsewhere in the nation.

Rural areas need more jobs based, not only on agriculture, but also on medium and small industry, on research facilities, on distribution centers, and other enterprises which do not have to be in large metropolitan areas to prosper and grow. The economic weight of Defense and other government contracts for research, development, and production, as well as tax incentives and other programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, should be used for farm areas as well as in the big cities.

But government cannot do the job alone. Rural communities must develop their own civic consciousness, organize development groups to attract job-producing enterprises, and make the most of their natural resources and recreational opportunities. There must emerge a dedicated and imaginative local leadership in our rural communities.

The basic element for improving rural America is, of course, to eliminate the high cost—low price squeeze now throttling our farm communities. The decline of parity to 73 this September, largely because of higher machinery prices and lower hog prices, is not good for rural America. It is, indeed, tragic that the increase of 233.8 percent in our

gross national product since 1947 has been accompanied by a decrease of 6.6 percent in net income of farmers since 1947.

Government and private enterprise must evolve programs and policies which will reverse this disastrous trend. Unless effective corrective action is taken, efforts to rejuvenate our rural communities will be of no avail. It is good that in these trying times the National Farmers Union is putting forth restless and active leadership in proposing innovative possible solutions to the farmer's economic problems, nationwide and in the State of Montana, including such proposals as setting up a mechanism for enabling farmers and ranchers to engage in collective bargaining, commodity by commodity, with buyers, handlers and processors; limiting government payments to any one farm operator; providing more government low-cost credit to farmers and ranchers; and abolishing the so-called corporate farm.

The National Farmers Union stands foursquare for family farming, as I do. This is why I have always endorsed, and will always seek to preserve, the effective acreage limitation in the Federal Reclamation law limiting the Bureau of Reclamation from furnishing water at a cost carrying significant subsidy to more than 160 acres for each landowner. That provision is the bedrock of family farming in great areas of our nation, as much today as when it was enacted some 60 years ago.

You, the farmers and consumers in Montana, are particularly fortunate to have such a champion as my great and good friend, Senator Lee Metcalf. He is truly a dedicated public servant, who fights vigorously and continuously for the consumer's interests. His efforts against high cost electricity are particularly epochal and noteworthy. He has documented, time and again, the overcharges and the unconscionable high rates of return received by electric power companies at the expense of the consumer.

Montana has these problems too. Here in Great Falls, the consumer pays the Montana Power Company about \$5 per month more than he would pay in comparable cities elsewhere in the country, while the Company's actual rate of return—11.37 percent—is one of the highest of any electric utility in the country.

One reason for these high charges, and high rate of return, is lack of competition. Montana is the only State, except Hawaii, without a single municipal power system.

Traditionally there have been three principal means to protect the consumer's interest in low-cost, reliable, electric service. First, by the competition of other forms of energy, but such competition is now rapidly becoming obsolete even where the local power company doesn't own the gas company too. Second, by governmental regulation of rates and conditions of service, but such regulation has seldom been very effective and frequently it is pure sham. Third, by the yardstick of public and cooperative power which helps to measure the reasonableness of the rates and services of electric companies by comparison with the operations of municipal, public utility district, and rural cooperatives electric systems.

The yardstick depends largely on the hydropower generated at Federal dams. This is because of all the electric energy generated in this country in 1966, State and local bodies produced only 10 percent, and cooperatives produced only 1 percent, whereas the Federal Government produced 13 percent. All the rest (76 percent) was produced by the investor-owned, profit-making companies. But the yardstick is not as effective as it ought to be, because less than half (48.6 percent) of this Federally generated power was sold to preference customers such as municipalities, rural cooperatives, public utility districts, States and other public agencies. About one-sixth (17.8 percent) was consumed by the Federal



Government itself, and over one-third (33.6 percent) was sold to private industry and investor-owned utilities.

The Federal Power Commission predicts that total electric consumption in the United States will at least double between now and 1980. Federal power production, therefore, should also double, at least, if we are to maintain even the present inadequate yardstick. Unfortunately, the trend is in the other direction.

We must begin to think very seriously about public agencies engaging in thermal generation of electricity if we are going to be able to maintain the Federal yardstick. Traditionally, Federal power has meant hydropower. Even today, TVA is the only Federal entity with its own thermal generation. However, hydro alone will not provide the large increase in Federal power and energy required to maintain the present minimum Federally-generated proportion of all power produced in this country.

Furthermore, as new hydropower sources become scarce, and existing Federal hydropower is more and more reserved for peaking operation, it tends to lose its yardstick quality. With private steam plants carrying the base load, and the coordinated output sold at composite rates, which often include a private wheeling toll, it becomes difficult or impossible to compare Federal and private prices.

At the same time, however, the growing importance of hydropower for peaking purposes will make it feasible to develop many marginal hydro sites which previously were thought to be uneconomic because of their limited amount of water to produce energy. We should therefore urge that all such sites be reevaluated for Federal development as peaking plants. In many cases, these marginal sites can be made very useful for peaking power by inclusion of pumped storage facilities, which make possible the carrying of large peak loads with very small streamflow, provided, of course, they are operating as part of an adequate base load system.

Hydropower, therefore, can still have a great role in the future of the yardstick. However, it is under heavy attack. Unless consumers act to protect their interest in low cost electricity, its role is going to be whittled away. It is ironic that the well-financed campaigns by private power companies against new Federal hydropower projects has been inadvertently aided by well-intentioned people, who are as devoted to conservation as I am, who fear that dams will damage fish, birds or whitewater canoeing.

I do not think that dams are necessarily destructive to the principles of resource conservation. On the contrary, the reservoirs provide water for municipal purposes, flood control, irrigation, industrial use, and many forms of recreation, including boating, swimming, fishing, etc. Hydropower dams are a renewable resource, and frequently are less destructive to the natural environment than any other form of electric generation. They do not pollute the air with smoke and radioactivity, or the water of our rivers and lakes with heat or radioactive wastes.

Conservation consists of the most effective long term use of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind. It involves respect for mother earth. It does not imply idolizing one value—for instance, the sport of shooting rapids in rubber boats—to the exclusion of all others. It means reverent use, not non-use, of the gifts God has provided to man.

If we are to have more Federal dams, we must take our case to the public. We must describe the dangerous alternatives. We must explain the true meaning of conservation. But it is not enough simply to have Federal dams and powerplants. It is also necessary to be vigilant in protecting the public's rights to the power produced by such Federal powerplants. For example, on July 31 of this year the Secretary of the Interior signed a long-

term contract with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company which makes the entire Central Valley Project power system in California an appendage of the company until the year 2005, freezes the load growth of existing preference customers, excludes the opportunity of other preference customers to obtain the benefits of low-cost Federal power, and subjects the Government and its customers to an intricate set of restrictions that will almost inevitably insure their permanent domination by the company.

For four years I fought, along with several other Members of Congress, to eliminate or modify the many unconscionable features of the contract, some of which were severely criticized by the Federal Power Commission and the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. Our efforts resulted in various changes which improved the contract in some respects for both the Government and its preference customers.

I am sorry to say, however, that the contract was still heavily loaded in the Company's favor. Secretary Udall has said he will try to help the various smaller municipalities of Central and Northern California to assure their future power needs at economical costs. However, I have the gravest misgivings that the contract which he signed with the Company, over my objection, will make it most difficult, if not impossible, for the municipalities to develop their own sources for their future power needs, and for the Secretary to be of much help to them.

The struggle for low-cost electricity in the next decade or two will become increasingly great in the field of nuclear power. I understand that 55 percent of the new generating capacity contracted for in the United States last year was for nuclear power plants. The most significant feature of these plants is their large size. The average capacity of the 32 plants contracted for construction after 1967 will be 625 megawatts. The average size of the nuclear generating units ordered last year—which is the latest figure in the AEC report—will be 790 megawatts. Indeed the smallest plant in the list for future completion is 450 megawatts.

Of course, the economies which result from large generators is the reason for the increasing capacity of new atomic plants. The AEC estimates the cost of production from a 500 megawatt nuclear plant at 4.4 mills per kilowatt hour. TVA has already begun construction of two nuclear plants, each over 1100 megawatts, which will produce energy at a cost of 2.37 mills per kilowatt hour.

4.4 mill nuclear power may or may not be competitive with coal, but 2.37 mill energy is competitive even with hydropower. But you have to be awfully big to afford an 1100 megawatt plant. TVA is paying \$122,700,000 for two of them—plus costs of the transmission plant, contingency allowance, and interest during construction, which run the bill up to \$247,000,000—plus \$232,000,000 for a twelve-year fuel supply. Significantly, however, even the investment in the plant itself, on a dollars-per-kilowatt basis, will be less than for a comparable coal plant—\$116 compared to \$117. But there are few non-Federal public power agencies or rural co-ops that are big enough to engage in the generation of atomic power.

Of the 20,003 megawatts of total capacity of nuclear power plants under contract for completion after 1967, only TVA's 2,229 megawatts and the Omaha Public Power District's 450 megawatts—the smallest on the list—will be publicly owned.

The Hanford plant on the Columbia River, the only other large publicly owned nuclear power facility in the country, was built by the Atomic Energy Commission to make plutonium for bombs. The Commission considered producing electricity at Hanford itself, but the Congress would have preferred to waste the steam. Only after a bitter fight

was this waste prevented, by legislation permitting a group of Washington State public power districts to recycle steam from the cooling water through their generator to produce 786 megawatts of useful power—but then only on condition that they offer 50 percent participation to the private companies. The private power interests today are very strong indeed.

Another example of their strangle-hold is shown in the recent struggle over appropriations for the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam in Maine, the first Federal hydroelectric project in the Northeast, which Congress authorized in 1965 by a narrow margin. In this Congress, the House of Representatives, with the approving votes of most of the New England Congressmen, where power costs are the highest in the Nation, voted against the appropriation. It is most significant that the very threat of this project has led to at least five rate reductions from private power companies in Maine.

The very success of the TVA in developing a once poor and backward region has made the private power industry vow never to permit it to happen again; and so far, they have kept their vow. There are no plans to repeat even the Hanford 50 percent public-50 percent private arrangement. Even half a loaf to the public is too much.

A potential new fuel for making electricity is geothermal steam—natural underground steam. Certainly steam under the public lands of the United States is a public resource that ought to be developed for public benefit either by the Government itself, or at least by public and cooperative bodies under a preference clause. The Department of the Interior proposed a leasing act to this Congress for geothermal steam. It contains no preference clause. Instead it provides for sale of steam leases to the highest bidder—again pricing the little fellows out of the market.

Almost sixty years ago, in vetoing a bill to give away a hydropower site on the James River in Missouri, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote as follows:

"The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because it is in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience."

"To give away, without conditions, this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly. If we are guilty of it, our children will be forced to pay an annual return upon a capitalization based upon the highest prices which 'the traffic will bear'. They will find themselves face to face with powerful interests entrenched behind the doctrine of 'vested rights' and strengthened by every defense which money can buy and the ingenuity of able corporation lawyers can devise. Long before that time they may and very probably will have become a consolidated interest, controlled from the great financial centers, dictating the terms upon which the citizen can conduct his business or earn his livelihood, and not amenable to the wholesome check of local opinion."

"I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent this growing monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this nation."

We need another Roosevelt today. Already electric power is the nation's largest industry. Its capital assets are 60 percent larger than those of the next largest industry—petroleum refining. Twelve percent of all capital invested in business in this country is under the control of the privately-owned electric power utilities. And they grasp for more at the public expense.

The State of New York has a fine public power authority, which generates 20 percent of the electricity produced in that State, from the waters of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers. These rivers are now almost fully



developed. Logically, to maintain the yardstick, and to retain the public share of the market, the New York Power Authority, like TVA, should begin building nuclear plants.

This is not what the State Administration has proposed. Instead, it proposes to bring power costs down by providing free atomic fuel to the private companies.

Unless an enlightened and outraged public demands otherwise, this may be the ultimate fate of the yardstick—to be replaced by a subsidy to the private companies which enables them to impose their excessive rates on both our light bills and our tax bills.

The proportion of Federally-generated power to privately-generated power must be maintained at least at its current level. How can public power survive the establishment of the large regional power pooling combines that are coming to be the predominant pattern of the electric power industry, if public generation does not keep pace with industry expansion? Either we maintain the balance between the private and public sectors of the industry or the electric industry will become ever more dominated and controlled by the large private monopolies within the next decade.

The second method of protecting the consumer from abuse by the monopolistic electric utilities is through government regulation of rates and services. There is vast room for improvement in this field, both by the State Commissions and by the Federal Power Commission. However, I believe that despite the prior inadequacies of such regulation, we should continue to work to improve and strengthen the regulatory role of both the Federal and State Commissions, and not abandon regulation as a tool for protecting the interests of the consumer.

Most of you are familiar with the efforts made during the last Congress by the private utilities to enact the Holland-Smathers bill which would exempt them from FPC jurisdiction. The bill was on its way to passage when the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred. That Blackout graphically demonstrated the interstate character of the electric industry and the need for more regulation, rather than less regulation, and effectively killed the Holland-Smathers bill in the last Congress.

But the private power utilities are not easily discouraged. The Holland-Smathers bill has reappeared in this Congress. It would exempt from Federal regulation, including Federal accounting and disclosure requirements, any electric company "whose facilities are all situated in a single State and are not used to transmit or receive electric energy by direct connection, from or to any other State, or by indirect connection, from or to any other State except for temporary or emergency purposes."

The Florida Power and Light Company, which is one of the principal supporters of the present Holland-Smathers bill, is the largest utility in the State of Florida, with assets of about a billion dollars. It is ninth in revenues, among the almost 3600 electric systems in the Nation. It claims that the "onerous" FPC accounting requirements will force it to raise its rates, and that it is already adequately regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission.

In 1964, Florida Power and Light Company's rate of return was 12.3 percent, the third highest rate of return on invested capital of any power company in the country. In 1965 the Chairman of the Florida regulatory commission testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that in his opinion the best utility regulation "is little or no regulation." In 1966, a newspaper reporter who asked the director of the finance department of the Florida Commission about Florida Power and Light's rate base was told: "Where it is, if it still exists, I don't know." The law of Florida does not provide for any regulation of wholesale rates and service. Thus,

if the Holland-Smathers bill should pass, there would be no one to require Florida Power and Light Company to sell electricity to a co-op, and perhaps ultimately, no more co-ops in Florida.

Florida Power and Light is not directly connected to any out-of-state utility. It is connected to Florida Power Corporation, which in turn is connected to the Georgia Power Company. The interchange contract between Florida Power and Light and the Florida Power Corporation is not to be found in either the FPC or the Florida Public Service Commission files. It apparently has never been put in writing. It remains more secret even than Florida Power and Light's rate base.

The new Holland-Smathers bill, although apparently motivated to fit the Florida Power and Light pattern, can also serve as the vehicle for exempting many other private electric utility companies from FPC jurisdiction, simply through the device of setting up a separate corporation to hold title to a substation, or other facility (even merely a 10-foot stretch of wire) at the state boundary, so that the utility is not connected "directly" to facilities in the next state.

I intend to continue opposing the Holland-Smathers bill. What the country needs is not exemption from FPC regulation, but more FPC regulation to insure better performance, better reliability, more equitable prices and conditions of service, and maximum protection from blackouts in the Nation's electric power industries.

Perhaps these benefits may come in the proposed Power Reliability Act which the FPC sent to Congress after the blackout of last June on the PJM system in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware which affected 13 million people.

In my opinion, the FPC bill offers a sound approach to the problem of reliability and adequacy of power planning and power transmission. However, as I studied the FPC bill I found a number of oversights or defects which should be corrected. Therefore, on August 14, I introduced a revised bill (H.R. 12322) which would, in my judgment, remedy those deficiencies.

The purpose of this legislation is not merely to prevent more cascading power failures. It is also designed to assure, in accordance with the national policy adopted 32 years ago, that there will be an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States, with the maximum possible economy and with due regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources. This bill would also clarify the Congressional mandate to the Federal Power Commission to consider esthetic and historic values in carrying out its regulatory duties concerning electric power.

The FPC bill, and to a greater extent, my bill, views the electric power industry as one nationwide public utility, consisting of all the local generating and transmission entities, including the public, private, and cooperative segments thereof. Both bills require organization of the industry into regional councils to plan, coordinate, and provide the most reliable, efficient, and economic service to all the people of the region, regardless of who provides retail distribution service, and to exchange and coordinate power with neighboring regions.

Strong interconnection between adequate generation is the key to power reliability in areas of heavy energy consumption. Every one of the 18 cascading power failures starting with the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred because of inadequate interconnections. The Holland-Smathers bill in addition to its many other faults, would discourage interconnection, and hence decrease reliability. The Electric Power Reliability bill would help strengthen interconnections and thus increase the reliability of electric power systems.

Both the FPC bill and my bill seek to achieve these objectives by voluntary cooperation of the various managements within the regions. Both bills require that the regional councils be open to membership by all segments of the power industry so that all plans developed by the regional councils will be the product of all the power systems, including the public, private, and cooperative power networks within the same region.

My bill corrects an oversight in the FPC bill to provide for participation, on a voluntary basis, by State regulatory commissions as well as the utilities, in regional council work. Both bills empower the FPC to compel participation in council work by recalcitrant generating and transmission entities; however, my bill adds an explicit provision requiring such entities also to share reasonably in the council's expenses. Both bills provide that the FPC may review, and, if necessary, revise regional council plans; but both provide that the plans are to be developed in the first instance by the local utilities in the region.

The FPC bill provides that those who act pursuant to a regional plan shall be immune from suits for damages and injunctive relief under the antitrust laws by those who are hurt by such actions. I think such grant of immunity from suit under the antitrust laws would be a dangerous weakening of the protections against arbitrary monopoly actions. Furthermore, I believe the courts are a better forum than the FPC to resolve disputes under the antitrust laws. Hence, my bill does not authorize the FPC, by its approval of the plans of the regional councils, to confer antitrust immunity.

Both bills contemplate the establishment of mandatory reliability criteria by the FPC for bulk power supply facilities, which may be of nationwide or regional applicability. These criteria would be promulgated only after consultation with the regional councils, and may, in fact, be developed in the first instance by the councils. My bill differs in only two words from the FPC bill concerning reliability standards. I say the Commission "shall" promulgate regulations setting forth reliability criteria; and the FPC bill says it "may". Clearly, the criteria must be promulgated, and my bill explicitly so provides.

The FPC bill recognizes that the construction and operation of extra-high-voltage lines, those over 200,000 volts, will involve aesthetic values. I want to provide increased protection to these values.

The FPC bill would authorize the FPC to appoint advisory coordination review boards, but does not explicitly encourage the appointment of persons interested in conservation and aesthetics to those advisory boards. My bill will do so.

In addition, my bill expressly prohibits the grant of rights-of-way for extra-high-voltage power lines in national parks, national monuments, national battlefields, historic sites, and all other areas administered by the National Park Service, except three types of areas. The excepted areas are national parkways, which are narrow strips hundreds of miles long, and two varieties of recreation areas which frequently surround existing power dams and do not have preservation of the natural environment as their primary purpose.

My bill also goes beyond the FPC bill by authorizing the administering agency of Federal land to veto a proposed EHV power line over Federal lands, not only on the ground that it would endanger aesthetic or historic values, but also if it would endanger identified species of flora or fauna. I have also added a provision to clarify that the Electric Power Reliability Act will not supersede the Wilderness Act in any way.

Both the FPC bill and my bill require review by the FPC before extra-high-voltage transmission lines may be built. One reason



is to provide a forum for reviewing the aesthetic consequences of proposals such as Potomac Edison's plan to run an EHV line near Antietam battlefield in Maryland. The other reason is technological. The FPC will have an opportunity to determine whether the EHV line is adequate to do the job for which it is intended, whether it will increase the reliability of service at both its terminals, as it should, or increase the chances of cascading failures, as it should not.

My bill goes another step beyond the FPC bill, and makes extra-high-voltage lines true public utilities, giving to every electric entity the right to increase the capacity of such lines, by whomever owned, at its own expense and subject to FPC regulation and technological review, and to participate in joint use of such lines. This addition to the bill is important, both aesthetically and economically, because it will reduce the need for unsightly and costly paralleling facilities. It recognizes the fact, which is far too frequently overlooked, that transmission lines are part of this Nation's transportation system.

I have revised greatly the FPC bill's provision for granting rights-of-way across Federal lands for EHV lines. Under my bill rights-of-way over Federal land may be granted for a limited term, not in excess of 50 years; or for an unlimited duration. However, if the right-of-way is granted for an unlimited duration, then the FPC will have continuing jurisdiction at intervals of not less than 10 years to add to or change the conditions of the right-of-way grants.

The FPC bill makes no provision for payment to the United States for use of its land. Mine does.

The FPC bill completely overlooks Indian rights in Indian reservations. The Indians, rather than the Government, are the true owners of the reservations, many of which were set up by solemn treaty guaranteeing that no one would ever be permitted to reside or cross over them without the Indian's consent. My bill requires Indian consent before any EHV right-of-way can be granted through an Indian reservation, and, when consent is given, it requires the utility to pay the Indians for the use of their lands.

Both bills authorize the FPC, on its own motion, to compel interconnections between power systems—again giving priority to efficient public service for the consumers of a region. My bill, however, goes further, requiring each entity, public or private, to wheel power for other entities to the extent of excess capacity in its lines. For this service, it would, of course, be entitled to fair compensation.

I have added provisions to the FPC bill at several places to insure that the public receives notice of what is proposed and has access to information on file. Thus, when a statement of organization of a regional council, or a regional plan, is filed, I would require the FPC to give notice of the filing in the Federal Register, whereas the FPC bill requires such notice only in case of an EHV transmission line proposal. Furthermore, under my proposal, all filings which are permitted or required to be made will be available for public inspection, including coordination contracts, such as for joint ownership or operation of generators and transmission lines.

I have also included a new section directing the Federal Power Commission to survey existing and planned extra-high-voltage testing laboratories in the United States and to report to Congress within one year whether any action is needed to provide more laboratories and to make them available to all persons desiring to test their EHV facilities. At the present time there are only two laboratories in this country, in contrast to 20 abroad, able to test extra-high-voltage equipment under operating conditions. Both American laboratories are maintained by in-

dividual manufacturers for their own use. I need not stress the hazard that inadequately tested equipment presents to reliable service.

You will be interested to know that I have been receiving considerable mail from people all over the country supporting and commending the revisions which my bill would make in the FPC's Electric Power Reliability bill. These include conservation groups (such as the National Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources, the Sport Fishing Institute, the National Recreation and Park Association, the North American Wildlife Foundation, and others), various Indian tribes who support the provisions of my bill which will protect against arbitrary seizure of their lands, and public power groups such as the Northeast Public Power Association which advised me that it endorses and supports my bill and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which commended the "very substantial improvement" my bill makes over the FPC version. I was particularly pleased by the letter from the Cooperative League of the USA which stated:

"The changes and additions you have made to the original FPC bill, in their general thrust and intent, perform a valued service for the American Consumer and for the typical member of an American cooperative . . . You have come up with meaningful improvements . . . These proposals reflect a deep and valuable understanding of this whole involved field . . . which puts in your debt the American electric consumer in whose behalf you have fought so valiantly."

The private power utilities, however, have not been idle. They are mobilizing all their resources to oppose the bill, in communications and contacts with the Federal Power Commission, the Committees and Members of Congress, and within the Electric Power Fraternity. Unless you, as consumers speak up to protect your interests in low-cost power and maximum reliability of electric service, you will have only yourself to blame if your electric bill goes up instead of down, and your electric power flickers or goes out when you need it most. I assure you that those who will be considering this bill in the days ahead—the Committees and Members of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, and the President—all of them want to know, indeed, need to know—what the consumer thinks about this bill.

I cannot predict when this bill will be enacted. A few more blackouts may hasten its enactment. But of this I am sure—that the national need for maximum reliability of electric service will inevitably demand the enactment of this bill, or similar legislation.

In the meantime, as consumers who want low-cost power, you must work together to make sure that the economies of large-scale generation and transmission will be passed on to the consumer instead of into the salaries of company officials and the dividends of company stockholders. You must work to strengthen the governmental tools for protecting the consumer's interest. This includes both improved regulation of the monopolistic utilities, and the maintenance and strengthening of the yardstick of competition resulting from the availability of low-cost public power. You must participate in all the benefits of pooling, and not permit the public and cooperative sectors of the electric industry to be smothered by private power domination of the benefits of large-scale generation and transmission. For example, the new 125 miles of 345 kilovolt transmission line which the Bureau of Reclamation will soon be building between Fort Thompson, South Dakota and Grand Island, Nebraska will help strengthen the Upper Missouri River Basin electric grid and confer regional advantages that will greatly benefit your members, the region, and the nation too.

I am confident that you will maintain your alertness to the opportunities and the dangers that lie ahead for the consumer of electric power as the industry continues its massive expansion in the next decade.

I intend to continue my efforts to help consumers obtain all the electricity they desire, at the lowest possible cost, and with the maximum possible reliability of service. I shall welcome your support and cooperation. I shall be glad to work with you in the common cause.

#### HOW THE OEO WORKS IN TROY, MO.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in newspapers in my district October 5 and 6, 1967:

#### OEO MAKES CLAIM ON TROY TRAINING

KANSAS CITY.—Troy, Mo., was cited Wednesday by a federal official as an example of where careful investment of tax funds have produced tangible results.

Don Thomason, director of the North Central Region of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said in a speech at a regional meeting of the Better Business Bureau Wednesday that in two months time there have been 100 families in the Lincoln County seat of about 1,800 persons who have become self-supporting through the program.

"A manpower coordinator hired for the area served by the Daniel Boone Human Development Corporation immediately organized a high school equivalency class of 165," he said.

He said that during July and August 100 people had been placed in jobs, and of these about 90 per cent were heads of families and over 60 per cent had been referred to the program by the Welfare Department. Their average monthly salary is now approximately \$281.45, and two earn over \$600, he said.

The net gain in monthly salaries in the Troy area of \$28,145 is impressive, he said.

This claim was both interesting and startling to me since I live in Troy, Mo. One hundred families would represent about 400 people—at four to a family—or some 22 percent of the 1,800 people the poverty press release says live in the Lincoln County seat of Troy.

I wrote to find out who my 400 fortunate neighbors were. I found out that when the OEO says Troy, it means Lincoln, Franklin, Warren, St. Charles, and Montgomery Counties in Missouri. So you must translate Troy, Mo., to include over 3,000 square miles and that means to include the population of those five counties. So you should translate 1,800 people into 132,000. Unfortunately, this ruins your percentage of social betterment because your increase goes from 22 percent to .001 percent.

When I at last received the list of the 100 families, by then I should have realized it would not contain 100 names. It did not. It contained 125. And, of the 125, 18 were from Lincoln County. This does not necessarily mean they were from Troy, but let us give the poverty program the benefit of the doubt because they will take it anyway.

Of these 18, two have become self-



supporting by working for the poverty program, I suppose this is "Operation Bootstrap." Twelve of the remaining residents of Greater Troy have been made so self-supporting that they now earn from \$156 to \$208 per month.

I recognize some of the names as recent high school graduates who might have found a job and gone to work after getting out of high school even without a poverty program. None of the 18 from Lincoln County have been made self-supporting at a rate as high as \$400 per month.

The about 1,800 persons the OEO found in Troy does represent a substantial part of the actual population of Troy, which is 2,470. I defer to their mathematician as to whether this error is 25 percent or 33 1/3 percent.

If success like this can be continued, we may even see the day when the project officials, whom I am assured now earn more than \$156 a month, will become self-supporting.

#### NORTH CAROLINA SELLS TO THE WORLD

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a trade mission from North Carolina left on a 3-week trip through South America, seeking new trade and investment opportunities for North Carolina businesses. The 12-man team was organized by the State of North Carolina, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Before they left, the members met with Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, for an all-day briefing on the South American market situation, and for tips on how to expand exports. Gov. Dan K. Moore hosted a reception for the group and for the ambassadors of countries that the trade mission will visit, as part of the sendoff ceremonies.

The itinerary includes Venezuela, Peru, Chile, and Brazil. This practice of sending trade missions overseas is not a new experience for North Carolina businessmen. Last year, a similar group went to Europe where they made on-the-spot sales of \$170,000 and established contacts having an estimated sales potential of \$10 million for the future.

This year's group includes: Edward L. Mercaldo, export consultant, North Carolina State Department of Conservation and Development, will head the group.

Other members are J. H. Berkelhammer, director of sales, United Brass Works, Inc., Randleman, N.C.; P. H. Brown, president, P. H. Brown & Associates Inc., Raleigh; H. J. Caldwell, president, Charlotte Aircraft, Charlotte; John Votta, export manager, Wica Chemicals, Inc., Charlotte; R. G. Gurley, president, Gurley Milling Co., Selma; James A. Hackney, president, J. A. Hackney & Sons, Inc., Washington; Roger L. Knight, president, Winton Products Co., Charlotte;

Paul A. Linney, manager of international operations, Aeroglide Corp., Raleigh; Clarence M. Robbins, sales manager, Long Manufacturing Co., Tarboro; Donald Kuntz, vice president, Superior Continental Corp., Hickory, and Harvey Diamond, president, Plastic-Vac, Inc., Charlotte.

The way to create more jobs and higher profits is to go out there and sell. The North Carolina trade mission demonstrates that we are ready and able to do just that.

#### DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost incredible to me that today, or some time this week or next we are to be called upon to reconsider the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Rejected by a majority of 64 votes within recent weeks, we are asked to accede to the unreasonable demands of the Senate in appropriating additional funds for this wasteful project.

We are asked to accede to our sister legislative body in the face of the fact that 2 years ago the legislative papers of this project were literally stolen—frustrating the then and now will of this House—and leaving us in a completely untenable legislative position: accept the entire public works authorization bill or reject it all over this worthless project.

I am normally a reasonable and calm man, but I cannot stand in this Chamber and see such a project pass. I cannot accept in good faith any move made from this floor to accede to the Senate on a matter in which extremely bad faith has been clearly exhibited.

Mr. Speaker, rarely, if at all, have I known of lobbying efforts as practiced on such a scale for this wasteful, duplicatory, obsolete, tax-eating project. Its supporters have reached to some of the highest places in the land to actively lobby for it.

Mr. Speaker, the view of this House is more than abundantly clear—we have rejected and rejected this project—we have been sidetracked and maneuvered; but I believe our resolution and determination is clear—save the taxpayers—the weary taxpayers of this Nation—reject finally this turkey of gold.

#### A TRIBUTE TO LT. CHARLES WILLIAM (BUTCH) DAVIS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic events in the recent his-

tory of our country occurred here in the Nation's Capital last weekend. The tragedy of this so-called peace demonstration is not that it happened here or that some of the soldiers and marshals were injured preventing a mass takeover of the Pentagon. Neither was it tragic that it cost the American taxpayer an untold amount of money to protect their military nerve center and to clean up after Dr. Spock and his flower children. It is sad, but not tragic, to see the dirty, bearded, shaggy young people who flocked to the Capital to participate in this fiasco. We can hardly feel sorry for the adults, or I should say, older people who were on hand. All this is unfortunate, but not tragic.

The real tragedy of this demonstration over the weekend came, in my estimation, from the messages of congratulations sent to the marchers from officials of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind now that such public outbursts of opposition to our Nation's policies give aid and comfort to our enemies. Article three of our Constitution states, and I quote:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.

Mr. Speaker, these demonstrators were adhering to our enemies and giving them aid and comfort just as surely as Benedict Arnold gave aid and comfort to our enemies years ago. Because of their actions and their demonstrations, our enemies of today will continue and even strengthen their fight to take over Southeast Asia. Many of these demonstrators cry loudly for "negotiations now." Why should the enemy negotiate when the world press proclaims that the American public is against the war? They will never negotiate as long as there might be a chance that we will give in to the peaceniks and get out of Vietnam.

While the flower children were demonstrating against a cause they know nothing about, the town of Tallahassee, Ala., was mourning the death of a young man who had given his life for this cause and for our country. Lt. Charles William Davis died as a result of enemy action in the Mekong Delta in South Vietnam. Lieutenant Davis was not a draft-dodger, physically unfit or a misfit, as were many of those at the Pentagon Saturday. As a result, he was killed fighting to protect the freedoms that each of us in America, including those demonstrators, enjoy.

This demonstration was headlines in every major newspaper in the world this weekend. Every television and radio station carried it as their lead story. Not one word of all that was worth as much to me as a small article on the second page of last Thursday's Tallahassee Tribune. This article was a tribute to the memory of Lieutenant Davis, written by a former high school classmate of his. Mr. Speaker, I insert this article to be printed in the RECORD in its entirety:

A TRIBUTE TO LT. CHARLES WILLIAM (BUTCH) DAVIS  
(By Nan Bragg, 1962-63 editor, Tallahassee News)

It is hard for many of us to accept the war in Vietnam and what is happening over

there. Right now it is especially hard for the people of Tallahassee because on October 6, 1967, a very dear friend of everyone, young and old alike, was killed in action in the Mekong Delta area of South Vietnam.

Twenty-four year old Charles William "Butch" Davis was known for his smiling face and great personality. This is well illustrated in the nickname "Monkey" which his friends at Marion Institute gave him and which he carried to Jacksonville State University. He was a casual friend of thousands and a close friend of many. If you met Butch even one time, I am sure you know what it means to say he is unforgettable. If you got down in the dumps, Butch was always there to cheer you up and if he couldn't do it, then you might as well forget it because it couldn't be done.

Football has always been close to Butch's heart and this can be seen as he is remembered as the captain of the 1961 Tallahassee High School football team. That was the year Tallahassee won the Border Conference championship. It was a cold winter's night in Lafayette, Alabama. Tallahassee must win the game to become the champions. There were 33 seconds left in the game and Lafayette was ahead. On the next play the ball was handed to Butch and he ran with all his strength and might as was the case every time he carried the ball. He shook off two tacklers and drug three more into the end zone with him as the referee yells touchdown and the fans cheer as Tallahassee becomes the new Border Conference champions.

Butch was just as hard working and determined in anything he tried to do. Well, maybe football and loyalty to his family and friends did win out over everything else but that is the way it should have been.

Now Butch is gone and we must learn to accept the fact that he is in Heaven gazing down over the whole world and watching with those smiling brown eyes and that cute grin the actions of each and everyone of the members of his family and friends.

Yes, Butch is in Heaven with God and the only consolation to his family, relatives and to us who knew and loved him so dearly is that Lt. Charles William Davis died fighting for his country and for the lives of the people that he loved so dearly.

Butch will always be remembered as brightening the lives of people. His laughter, his kind words and everything about him shall never be forgotten. One day we shall join him in heaven and can talk and laugh with him again personally as I am sure he is doing right now with his relatives and friends who were already receiving the blessings of heaven.

I have fought a good fight,  
I have finished my work.

—2 Timothy 4:7

#### CREATIVE FEDERALISM IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that air pollution respects no political boundaries. One State's industrial waste can become another State's health problem as easily as the autumn breezes can change direction. This element of geographical instability might well have been used as an excuse for an air pollution program totally funded, ad-

ministered, and controlled by the Federal Government. Instead, however, President Johnson has wisely urged the Congress to attack the problems of air pollution within the framework of creative federalism. Vice President HUMPHREY elaborated on the wisdom of this approach last December when he told the Third National Conference on Air Pollution:

Some people believe that the problem can be solved locally, and they believe it very strongly. Others suggest that we have come full circle, and that the Federal Government must assume the full responsibility. Well, I am not like that old fellow who said, when he was asked to take a stand on an issue in the local election: "I have friends on both sides, and I stand squarely with my friends."

I think there is a rather realistic and meaningful approach to our problem. It is my view that you can't do this locally, and it is my view that the Federal Government—on every single problem that confronts this nation today—while it must assume a sense of direction, or coordination, and do its part can't do it all. And even if it could, it shouldn't.

I happen to believe in what we call creative Federalism. I happen to believe in our system of government. I happen to believe that social responsibility is not only the duty of government—it is also the duty of citizens.

I happen to believe that one of the ways in which you can strengthen local and State government is to bring about a partnership of the three levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

So what I say is that neither approach, local control alone or Federal control alone, is adequate by itself. What we need is a working partnership among all levels of government, Federal, State, and local—a partnership that must also include private industry.

Mr. Speaker, the creative federalism concept described by the Vice President is embodied in the existing Clean Air Act and is continued and expanded in the Air Quality Act of 1967, as recently reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the first page of its report, the committee describes the principal purpose of the Air Quality Act of 1967, as follows:

The bill is intended primarily to pave the way for control of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 has the support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the President, and air pollution experts across the Nation. I urge the passage of this legislation in order that we may expand our efforts to control air pollution within the framework of creative federalism.

#### PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, historians, 20, 30, or 50 years from now, will give a valid ranking to President Johnson on

his performance as President. If his place were to be determined on the basis of a lot of the opinion that currently is being heard and read, his position would be low indeed. I do not attempt to place the President in his final historical context, but I am certain that a majority of the harsh judgments that are being made of him are unfair and I therefore enjoyed the following comments that appeared in Green's Commodity Market Comments on October 18, 1967:

#### PROFILE IN COURAGE

Every day appears to be a good day to criticize the man in the White House. Recently, even a leading magazine took time out to participate in the contest of disparaging epithets directed against the 36th President of the United States. We do not propose today to take a stand for or against the issues so vividly and irresponsibly discussed by so many, but we will try to analyze Lyndon Baines Johnson's motives for action.

Usually good actors are poor playwrights, and good playwrights do not perform well on the stage. John F. Kennedy was an excellent actor, his personal appearances were inspiring, his press conferences were literary events, and the brilliancy of his on-stage performance made up for the mistakes of judgment. A tragic event left the promise of youth unfulfilled, created a myth and put the subsequent President at a disadvantage. This problem was compounded when the intellectuals who played first violin in the JFK orchestra, unwilling to play second violin in the LBJ Band, decided apparently in unison to unload their frustration on the new conductor. The Schlesingers, Goodwins & Company must be forgetting that the greatness of America lies in its unsophistication, not in intellectual snobism. American democracy is horizontal, unlike Western Europe's, where it is vertical, and where political power, money and education are represented usually by a single person or combined in one family or club.

The man from Texas, who replaced the man from Boston and Hyannis Port, and who does not have the same aura of "savoir-faire" and "savoir-vivre" as his predecessor, recently stated what every thinking American should have known all along, i.e., that if he were concerned only with his own popularity, he would not have been going about things the way he has and would not suggest higher taxes or more war or similar unpopular actions. And that is the crux of the matter: LBJ is putting his own political future in jeopardy for the sake of his belief that he is doing the right thing for the United States.

We all know that even Johnson's enemies do not consider him incapable, not smart, or a political amateur; obviously, he has the opposite qualities and certainly weighs carefully the pros and cons of all his decisions, particularly those that concern the future of America and/or his own. The record shows that in this context he always chose America. Now whether or not President Johnson's judgment is right, only history will tell. But one thing is sure, that in pursuing his policy in a most unselfish way he has proven to be a better American than his critics. LBJ has stuck to his guns even at the cost of alienating large segments of the U.S. population; few political figures would do it. This courage and self-denial—not egotism as others claim—have brought the President nothing but abuse. Another "despised" man, in a letter to his sister written 200 years ago, made timeless and pertinent remarks about such slanderous assaults:

"As to the abuses I meet with . . . I number them among my honours. One cannot behave so as to obtain the esteem of the wise and good, without drawing on one's self at the



same time the envy and malice of the foolish and wicked, and the latter is a testimony of the former. The best men have always had their share of this treatment, and the more of it is in proportion to their different and greater degrees of merit. A man has therefore some reason to be ashamed of himself when he meets with none of it. And the world is not to be condemned in the lump because some bad people live in it. . . .

Not only adults—senators, teachers, taxi drivers, barmen and the like—abuse the presidency, but so do teenagers and college students, and there appears to be some sort of a race going on in the United States for the No. 1 spot in irresponsibility, blindness and vulgarity. American political life has always been full of it, yet reason ultimately prevailed in spite of the fact that those who had the least to say always yelled the loudest, as, for instance, students of some American universities who have an excellent record of wrong political judgment. In 1946, when an honorary degree was bestowed by Columbia University on one of the greatest men of this century, the then students demonstrated violently against him.

The "despised" man who 200 years ago wrote the letter quoted above was Benjamin Franklin; the man abused in New York 21 years ago was Winston Churchill. To the loneliest man in the nation, Lyndon Baines Johnson, today's target of vicious and irresponsible attacks, our sympathy and respect.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDIE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago the Hungarian people rose up in a valiant and courageous effort to regain their freedom. The events of the Hungarian revolution may have become dimmed with the passage of time so it would do well for us to review this historic uprising.

On October 23, 1956, what began as a peaceful demonstration by students and workers for their personal rights ended in a bloodbath as the Russian controlled secret police brutally machinegunned hundreds of people in the streets. Incensed by this act the Hungarian people, unaided and by their own bold heroism, drove the Russian occupation troops from their homeland. For 5 brief but glorious days the people of Hungary enjoyed the freedom the Communists had deprived them of since 1949. A governing body was quickly established and appeals for aid were sent to the free world. Moscow waited apprehensively to see how the United States and other nations would react. Finally, on November 4, upon the hesitation by the free nations, the Kremlin invaded Hungary with its tanks.

In the wake of this tragedy thousands of Hungarians fled their homeland, fearing for their lives and knowing that with the return of the Russians, liberty and freedom would be denied them. The United States did take action and opened her shores to hundreds and hundreds of homeless refugees.

The valor and heroism of the Hungarian people will go down in history as one of freedom's finest hours. It is imperative

that we keep in mind what the Hungarian revolutionaries fought for and what they fought against. The same forces of organized tyranny that oppressed Hungary are still striving to conquer all free nations and people. It would be wise for us, on the 11th anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution, to be fully prepared to meet the challenge of aggression in the years ahead.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POLLOCK (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for tomorrow and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business—National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PURCELL) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 30 minutes, on October 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND to include extraneous matter and tables in his remarks on H.R. 9960.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee to include a summary report and tables with his remarks on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation conference report today.

Mr. SIKES to include letters, tables, and other material with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 13606.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. HARSHA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PURCELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1173. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the number of permanent professors at the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1174. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to extend for 1 year, from October 1, 1967, through September 30, 1968, the concession contract authorizing Best's Studio, Inc., to provide a general art and photographic business for the public in Yosemite National Park, Calif., pursuant to the provisions of 79 Stat. 969; 16 U.S.C. 20; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 343. An act to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966 (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12912. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the State of Ohio to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the acts of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157), and November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1156); with amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13165. A bill to extend the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report entitled "Automobile Insurance

Study" (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 955. Resolution for consideration of S. 780, an act to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies; expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles; provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions; authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules: House Resolution 956. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5754, a bill to amend section 1263 of title 18 of the United States Code to require that interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors be accompanied by bill of lading, or other document, showing certain information in lieu of requiring such to be marked on the package (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 957. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12144, a bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 11641. An Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 820). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 821). Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11254. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Good (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 13653. A bill to amend the tobacco

marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 13654. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13655. A bill to repeal certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 13656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend (from 3 to 6 months following the quarter of use) the period within which claim for domestic drawback may be filed with respect to distilled spirits used for certain nonbeverage purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13657. A bill to amend section 504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax exemption of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13658. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 13659. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes on Coffee Creek, Trinity County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 13660. A bill to amend title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for grants for administrative support services to facilitate the participation of State and local public agencies in community relations programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 13661. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13662. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13663. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13664. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act to migrant health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 13665. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize a program of research and demonstration for the control of pollution in lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 13666. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 13667. A bill to authorize a survey of the Chilitipin Creek at and in the vicinity of Sinton, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 13668. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an additional monthly allowance for disabled beneficiaries who are in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13669. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes; to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities; and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 13670. A bill to authorize the county of Presidio, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Presidio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to hear a former Vietcong prisoner of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 958. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 356; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 959. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 356; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13671. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Contino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 13672. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Remblaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13673. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13674. A bill for the relief of Peter Stroitigoulakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13675. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13676. A bill for the relief of James Renjilian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13677. A bill for the relief of Winfield Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13678. A bill for the relief of Bette J. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## To Our Millions of Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, phenomenal has been the growth in recent years of golden age clubs, senior citizen organizations and retired men and women's groups; perhaps the most significant sequence to this movement has been the issuance of worthwhile publications slanted in the direction of their interests and needs of these elderly citizens.

Only recently has there been satisfactory communication between the growing number of retirees, in the fostering of information having particular application to citizens in their latter years.

One of the outstanding mediums helping to fill this void has been Lobby 65 Digest, published in Massachusetts by Frank Le Roy Johnson, 2 Wright Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, now in its second year.

Its readers are offered helpful hints for the use and exchange of talents; the understanding of ailments and ways to achieve savings in the purchase of drugs for their treatments; also suggestions for obtaining travel tour information, hearing aids and timely articles by competent authors on matters of common concern.

Lobby 65 Digest now has a wide distribution in Massachusetts. It is chartered by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a charitable, tax free, non-profit, nonpartisan, nonsectarian corporation.

Its columns have been filled by such men of competence as the following: Dr. Howard F. Root, Boston, of the Diabetes Foundation; Dr. William S. Clark, New York, on arthritis; Dr. Charles I. Schottland, former U.S. Commissioner of HEW, presently the dean of the Florence Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University.

Others have contributed articles, including Dr. Naif L. Simon, F.A.C.A. anesthesia department chief at the Quincy city hospital; Dr. Fredrick J. Stare on nutrition—Harvard School of Public Health; Judge Robert Gardner Wilson, the Shrine Burns Institute for Children in Boston; and Dr. Irving S. Cooper of St. Barnabas Hospital, New York on use of cryoprobe in cryosurgery, the technique for relief of Parkinson tremors.

Articles have also appeared in Lobby 65 Digest concerning the American Cancer Society; the Deafness Research Foundation of New York, and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Blindness.

Most of this information is useful in every State, especially when supplemented by information in local areas in which the publication is distributed. That probably accounts for the many inquiries Mr. Johnson has been receiving

from other States seeking the licensing of Lobby 65 Digest under his copyright. This publication is unique in the composition of its advisory board, which includes outstanding representatives among different races and religions.

It is dedicated to advancement, education, and service to the elderly; and seeks to spread the gospel of good will, mutual assistance, and spirit of togetherness—through the medium of "each helping the other." This undertaking of publishing Lobby 65 Digest has come about through the initiative, imagination, generosity, and talents of 69-year-old Frank Le Roy Johnson, a retired American citizen who has been received by Richard Cardinal Cushing and Gov. John W. Volpe, who have paid him high tribute for helping to solve the concerns, sharing sources of common interest, and for obtaining information most applicable to men and women—who under our American system of social security, face retirement after they reach the age of 65.

In addition, Lobby 65 Digest lists the names of officials of all the known clubs serving retired groups in Massachusetts—and aids in keeping each of these in contact.

Circulation of this publication under a charter license in other States will find ready recipients to share its intrastate valued columns and rewarding in the helpfulness it gives to its subscribers.

## Carnegie Foundation Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the courageous act of a very outstanding young man residing in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District. As a result of his outstanding feat of heroism, Paul Welton, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Welton, Portsmouth, Ohio, was selected by the Carnegie Foundation to receive an award for heroism.

Last February, Paul, who has been a carrier for the Portsmouth Times for almost 4 years, had just finished his route when he noticed the house across the street from where he was standing was afire. In spite of the imminent danger to himself, Paul ran into the house and rescued 7-month-old Ray Lee Traylor, carrying the baby to safety seconds before the room where he had been sleeping was engulfed in flames.

I know Paul Welton's parents and the citizens of Portsmouth are very proud of him for his courageous act of bravery. It is reassuring to know that we have such outstanding young citizens like Paul who reflect credit upon their families, communities, and Nation.

I would like to join with the many others who are congratulating this young man and extend to him my sincerest wishes for future health and happiness. He is indeed a credit to our younger generation.

## The United Nations Role

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, October 22, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, who now serves a dual role as U.S. Representative to the 22d session of the United Nations General Assembly, was the guest speaker at United Nations Day ceremonies in Oak Park, Mich.

After reading over Representative BROOMFIELD's address—focusing attention on the crucial future role of the United Nations—I knew his remarks would be of interest to all Members of Congress. His address follows:

## THE UNITED NATIONS ROLE

The United Nations was founded twenty-two years ago by nations that had just lived through a terrible war. It is dedicated to the ancient hope of all mankind for a world at peace—and the trees we plant here each year testify to our belief that all nations can work together toward this goal.

The trees we plant this year—in honor of Laos, New Zealand, and Belgium—mark the desire we share with these countries that where the peace is broken, it will be healed, and that where men now live at peace, the peace will be preserved.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have always taken an interest in the affairs of the United Nations. My appointment as a member of this year's delegation to the United Nations General Assembly has bestowed on me a great honor—not only to represent the United States in these critical times, but also to work directly with the Permanent United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg.

Ambassador Goldberg has asked me to bring his personal greeting to all the people of Oak Park on UN Day, and has asked me to read this message:

"The United Nations, that great center for harmonizing the action of nations, has served the world community through twenty-two turbulent years. Amidst the troubles and dangers that still prevail, we pause today to pledge anew our dedication to the United Nations' great aims of peace."

"The United Nations was founded not in the belief that it would guarantee permanent freedom from conflict and disagreement, but in the belief that the basic hopes of man are for peace rather than war, for rule by law rather than rule by violence, and for economic and social progress rather than disorder and stagnation."

"In working toward these goals, the United Nations will not always succeed. When its members are not sufficiently faithful to its purposes, it may fail. But as long as cooperation and mutual tolerance are essential to

our survival, its members will have no choice but to try again.

"In this great cause, in which the United States bears such a heavy burden, the faithful support of the American public—in times of difficulty as in times of success—is an invaluable source of strength. The citizens of Oak Park, through their interest in the United Nations, will help all of us as we work toward the goal of a more peaceful world."

Signed, Arthur J. Goldberg.

As the United Nations continues its work this fall, the world faces many stubborn problems: the unresolved conflict in Vietnam, the uneasy situation in the Middle East, the danger of nuclear weapons, and the unending struggle against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. But we must not lose patience because these problems are difficult.

The United Nations has long since demonstrated that when its members give it its support, it can be invaluable in the solution of the hardest problems. In its twenty-two years, the United Nations has contributed to peace and to the security of nations in such places as Iran, Greece, Kashmir, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus. It has contributed to progress in arms control, in human rights, and in the development of nations. Recently, it helped in concluding the Outer Space Treaty, a major success in the diplomacy of peace. Last June, it achieved a ceasefire in the Middle East and sent truce observers to prevent renewed fighting.

It is impossible to tell where the conflict in the Middle East might have led if there had been no United Nations to help bring it to a halt. And since the ceasefire, United Nations Truce Observers have assisted in preventing renewed outbreaks of fighting in the Suez Canal area which might have led to a major conflict, with the inevitable danger of big-power involvement.

The United States is continuing its search for ways in which the United Nations can contribute to a lasting Mid-east peace settlement. Largely because of the strong stand taken by the United States, along with other members of the United Nations, the Soviet Union was unable last summer to get the Emergency Session of the General Assembly to condemn Israel. Neither was the Assembly willing to adopt a Yugoslav resolution calling for immediate and unconditional Israeli withdrawal and postponing indefinitely the key issue—Arab renunciation of belligerency toward Israel. The United States believed that these resolutions would have done nothing to correct the basic causes of instability in the Middle East and could only have set the stage for renewed conflict.

The United States position was—and it still is—that the United Nations can contribute to a stable peace in the Middle East. The U.S. has said, however, that withdrawal of Israeli troops should not be considered in isolation from other factors—that withdrawal should be expected only in a context of peace. The key development must be Arab willingness to recognize that Israel has a right to exist independently, to live in peace and security free of claims or acts of belligerency. We believe the Arabs cannot reserve for themselves the right to maintain a state of war against Israel while demanding that Israel undertake the obligations of peace.

We also believe that bringing peace to the Middle East will require on both sides an affirmative will to resolve the issues through a process of mutual accommodation. Neither the United States nor any other outside power can dictate a solution. The United Nations can provide its good offices to help bring about agreement between the two sides—but any real solution must be one agreed upon by the states of the Mid-East themselves.

There are a number of basic features which the United States believes should be part of any lasting Mid-East peace settlement:

Each nation in the area must accept the

right of others to live. The least that this requires is that all should renounce any state or claim of belligerency.

Troops must be withdrawn—and withdrawn in a context of peace. For some parties cannot be left free to assert the rights of war while others are called upon to abide by the rules of peace.

There must be justice for the refugees.

Free and innocent passage through international waterways must be assured for all nations.

The status of Jerusalem must not be decided unilaterally but in consultation with all concerned, and in recognition of the historic interest of the three great religions in the Holy Places.

The political independence and territorial integrity of all states in the area must be respected.

Boundaries must be accepted and other arrangements made, superseding temporary and often violated armistice lines, so as to afford security to all parties against terror, destruction and war.

Last week, the President of the General Assembly, with the approval of the member states, proposed that the debate on the high priority Middle East item be postponed for a short period pending further consultations. It was generally agreed that unless the outlines of an agreement could be worked out before debate began, another round of debate on the Middle East could only have the effect of freezing positions, making an ultimate solution more difficult.

Ambassador Goldberg and other members of the United States Delegation have been among those engaged in intensive discussions throughout the past week in the attempt to help the states involved find the outlines of a generally acceptable United Nations resolution on the Middle East. Exactly what the results of these consultations will be, it is not yet possible to say. The goal toward which our delegation at the General Assembly continues to work is that of a stable peace.

The second great issue in the minds of all delegates to the UN today is the problem of Vietnam. The United States has repeatedly sought to have the UN Security Council act on Vietnam. Unfortunately, two permanent members of the Security Council have opposed any United Nations involvement with Vietnam and the Soviet Union has blocked Security Council discussion. In addition, the Hanoi government has denied the authority of the UN to even consider Vietnam. In the face of this hostility, the United Nations has been unable to act.

The United States, in both public and private statements at the United Nations, has made clear its commitment to a negotiated, political solution of the conflict in Vietnam. We have emphasized our willingness to base a settlement on the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962. And even though it may be unable to act on Vietnam, the United Nations continues to serve as a listening post, both for the United States to present its views, and for other nations to communicate with us.

It is said by some that Hanoi will agree to begin negotiations if the United States ceases the bombing of North Vietnam—that this bombing is the sole obstacle to negotiations. But no third party—including those governments which are among Hanoi's closest friends—has conveyed to us any authoritative message from Hanoi that there would in fact be negotiations if the bombing were stopped. On its part, the United States has made clear that it would be glad to consider and discuss any proposal that would lead promptly to productive discussions that might bring about peace in the area.

I know from my own work at the United Nations and in the Congress that the United States is looking and will continue to look for any possibility that the United Nations may be able to act in this situation. Our ultimate purpose is—and must be—to find a nego-

tiated settlement of the war in Vietnam—a negotiated settlement which will preserve the right of the South Vietnamese to self-determination.

The United Nations faces a number of other issues this fall—the question of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a communist demand for withdrawal of United Nations forces from South Korea, and continuing issues involving race relations in the southern part of Africa. Less dramatic than these, but perhaps equally important to the future of the UN itself, are a number of questions pertaining to the budget and administration of the UN. I myself have the responsibility for presenting the U.S. position on these issues in the Budget and Administrative Committee of the General Assembly.

The United States, as the richest nation in the world, is also the largest contributor to the United Nations. For this reason, it has a great interest in helping the UN to strengthen and improve its administration and management. I am pleased to report that we are continuing to press for reforms which will enable the United Nations—and in fact the many specialized agencies associated with it—to get the maximum effectiveness from each dollar it spends. One of the principal items thus far debated in the budget and administrative committee deals exclusively with this problem. It is only natural that the United Nations, faced with its many diverse and intractable problems, needs to keep its administrative machinery under constant scrutiny. With our great experience in management techniques and methods, we can and must help the United Nations to operate efficiently as possible. This is a difficult and stimulating assignment, and I hope to carry it out effectively.

As Ambassador Goldberg has said, the United Nations will not always succeed as it approaches the tasks before it. Often, the United Nations may seem to be long on debate and short on accomplishment. But when the United Nations does succeed—as it succeeded this summer in achieving a ceasefire in the Middle East—we recognize that the UN is not only one of man's greatest dreams, but can become one of his great accomplishments. Indeed, we cannot look for an alternative to the UN, for there is none. What we must do is strengthen the UN—and work through it toward the day when all men will be able to live their lives in justice and in peace.

## Lake Charles Memorial to Peace

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation's Capital is cleaning up the aftermath of the thousands of so-called "anti-war" demonstrators here over the weekend, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues another and more heartening movement being undertaken by the Young Men's Business Club of Lake Charles, La., in my district. The young men who comprise this club have raised 90 percent of the funds needed to erect what will be known as the Lake Charles Memorial to Peace. The purpose of the proposed monument which will be called a "peace" rather than a "war" memorial, is neither to condemn nor condone the war in Vietnam, but instead to pay



tribute to our American men who have fought and died there. Uniquely and functionally, the proposed Peace Memorial tower will stand 110 feet, support 46 aluminum purple martin castles, and will house swallows which can each day eat over 4,464,000 mosquitos and other insects which create nuisances and health hazards to our areas along the gulf coast.

I commend and support the members of the Young Men's Business Club of Lake Charles in their work and can think of no more fitting tribute to the American servicemen who have made the supreme sacrifice for our country while fighting Communist aggression. I cannot help but contrast the action of the young men of this club to those of the draft card burners and protestors who assembled in Washington to spew their venomous obscenities and leave a wake of destruction and filth.

### Nongovernment Aid

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me in these days when the interests of the United States are directed toward assisting developing nations toward self-help, determination, and growth, that it should be pointed out that nongovernmental voluntary agencies, based in the United States, are making some tremendous contributions to our national goals.

Let me cite an example—the Medical Mission Sisters, whose American Provincial House is at 8400 Pine Road, Fox Chase, Philadelphia, Pa. They were recently asked by the Government of Ghana, West Africa, to expand and upgrade the nurses' training school in their Bereken Holy Family Hospital. Theirs is the only school of nursing and midwifery in the Brong-Ahafo region, with a population of nearly 600,000. The average life expectancy in Brong-Ahafo is 38 years, with a particularly high infant and maternal mortality rate. The Medical Mission Sisters' school of nursing has an average of 300 qualified applicants each year, but can presently accommodate only 20. The Government of Ghana is unable to assist the expansion efforts financially, but has promised communal labor.

Even more interesting to me is that the people who will be educated in this upgraded program will be the indigenous people of the Brong-Ahafo region. They in turn will join the teams fanning out from this institution to bring medical aid and health education to the thousands out in the "bush." All of these services give to the people of Ghana not only health care and health education, but also give a sense of personal dignity and hope for development to a people trying to forge out a new nation.

This organization of Medical Mission

Sisters has worked long and hard under trying circumstances in this area. They have won the respect and confidence not only of the people they have nursed and doctored, but of Ghana's leaders who are striving for gains in every field of governmental endeavor. The Sisters' know-how, not only in medicine but in the daily lives of these people, their hopes and aspirations, has come to be a security to the people of Ghana. In changing times this group of women remains steadfast in its dedication and service to the needs of people everywhere and particularly now in developing nations.

Our country and its legislators should be aware of these efforts and the efforts of many other groups from the United States who have gained the confidence of the people of the emerging nations. It seems to me that if other countries and private foundations—the local governments and corporations involved in the area—are interested in the work of these groups, the U.S. Government through its AID program or other extensions of assistance on the part of our Government, should focus particular attention on practically adding our backing to the projected efforts of such groups wherever we can. We can only gain good will by such well-organized and recognized sources of help.

We here in the House, in meeting our responsibilities of following up on the expenditure of our appropriations, might do well to "count our blessings," back them up, and increase their yield, rather than to cry over misadventures which are past history and beyond second chances.

Mr. Speaker, this work of the Medical Mission Sisters may not be world shattering, but it is consistent, dependable and always yielding friends. I am compelled to call it to your attention and to that of my colleagues here in the House. It is an impressive contribution, not only in Ghana, but also in six other countries of Africa, and in India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Jordan, Venezuela, and South Vietnam. I personally wish to commend this group of sisters in particular, and all such groups in general for the contribution which they make to their country as well as to the country in which they operate.

### Speaker John W. McCormack Honored

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues, the fact that Monday, October 23, our distinguished and beloved Speaker received the coveted award of Statesman of the Year from the Argo Lodge of the B'nai B'rith.

For the information of my colleagues, and so that we may join in paying trib-

ute to our honorable Speaker, I would like to insert the speech of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, and the remarks of the other speakers who joined to honor him:

#### TRIBUTE TO B'NAI B'RITH

(Remarks of Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK)

Dr. Greenwood, President of Argo Lodge, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be at the Argo Lodge with you this evening. It is with the utmost humility and yet, paradoxically, with the greatest pride, that I accept this award which you have seen fit to bestow upon me—that of "Statesman of the Year": with humility, because I know that my efforts, in the context of history, must of human necessity be limited; with pride, because I value so highly the approval and recognition of an organization such as B'nai B'rith—an organization which has always distinguished itself by devotion to the political ideal of democracy, the social ideal of equal opportunity, and the humanistic ideal of individual dignity and worth.

B'nai B'rith is, as I am sure you must know, the oldest Jewish service group in the world, celebrating its one hundred and twenty-fourth birthday this month. B'nai B'rith has always, in my estimation, stood as a singular force in the long struggle of men for realization of their common bond in human brotherhood. It is an association devoted to preserving the cultural identity of Judaism, while seeking, nevertheless, to reconcile the best in Jewish ethical tradition with the American concept of democracy. In the Nation, and here in Washington, where it is so well represented by the Argo Lodge, B'nai B'rith has been an unrelenting devotee to the causes of citizenship, education, charity, and moral soundness—causes which both Judaism and Americanism have consistently espoused.

Let us consider for a moment the work of B'nai B'rith in educating the populace for responsible citizenship. This abiding concern of B'nai B'rith is antedated in the words of the great Hebrew sage Hillel, who counseled two thousand years ago: "Separate not thyself from the community." B'nai B'rith has staked its very existence upon this precept—that a man can realize his proper potential only by relating in an active and meaningful way to the society in which he lives. By cultivating in American citizens a sense of the richness of their heritage, and a concomitant sense of the responsibilities imposed by that heritage—by constantly striving to clarify the value and meaning of American citizenship, B'nai B'rith contributes substantially and unreservedly to upholding the principles which have made America strong.

In serving the ideal of education, no less than that of citizenship, B'nai B'rith is engaged in the vital task of reaching the minds and souls of youth—of guiding both the spiritual sensibilities and vocational aptitudes of that segment of our population upon which the very future of the Nation will depend. The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, the B'nai B'rith Vocational Service, and the Hillel Foundations are vital adjuncts of B'nai B'rith's commitment to young people of the Jewish faith—and, in a larger sense, of all America.

The cause of charity is a special interest of B'nai B'rith—more urgent perhaps, than the causes of citizenship and education—though no less vital; and I mean charity in the sense of benevolent social work, as well as charity in the sense of human compassion and brotherly love.

In the first case, to illustrate, I point out that B'nai B'rith actively participated in disaster relief thirteen years before the birth of the Red Cross, and established both orphan homes and hospitals soon after its inception



in the mid-nineteenth century. Throughout its history B'nai B'rith has been active in providing for Jews throughout the world who have suffered the bitter consequences of discrimination and oppression.

Of prime importance, in fact, in illustrating B'nai B'rith's concern for the cause of human understanding, is the task your organization has undertaken in seeking to dispel, wherever possible, the ugly manifestations of prejudice and intolerance. Created to inspire in all men a tolerance for others, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has many times over proved its effectiveness and worth. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the Anti-Defamation League stands among the vanguard of those organizations by whose efforts we enjoy a modicum of racial and religious harmony in the U.S. today—however, marred by rude intrusions of bigotry and violence that harmony may be.

Finally—in promoting the solid and time-proven ethical values contained throughout history by the vessel of Jewish culture and faith—in working to synthesize the ancient Jewish heritage of moral affirmation—based upon the threefold foundation of study, service, and benevolence—in working to synthesize the Jewish heritage with the distinctively American legacy of democracy and political freedom, B'nai B'rith is working to ensure the coming of that day when men may answer with proud affirmation the ancient question: Am I my brother's keeper?

The fundamental and salient purpose of B'nai B'rith is aptly summarized, I think, in a recently published statement of the B'nai B'rith Foundation:

"[B'nai B'rith] is both a creature and defender of Judaism. The programs it undertakes have a single underlying purpose—to strengthen and stimulate Jewish community life.

"This . . . is a task of two dimensions. In a free society where Jews have that greatest of freedoms—the right of being themselves—there is a correlative responsibility for Jews to express their religious heritage creatively, in ways that contribute to democratic living.

"This is B'nai B'rith's cause.

"The other side of the problem exists in lands where Jews are told how to be Jewish—denied the right to be Jews on their own terms. Here the task is to fight against the discriminations and the forced erosions of Jewish religious and cultural life.

"This too is B'nai B'rith's cause."

In short, B'nai B'rith is a source of constant strength in our National striving for the recognition by every man of the integrity of every individual and of every religious and ethnic group; for the triumph of principle and the vindication of right; for the noble assertion of mind and spirit over the baseness of appetite and the pride of passion. The long history of your organization, which has grown from 12 to over 500,000 members, is a testament to the opportunities for human improvement which democracy provides. It is as the late President Kennedy so aptly stated:

"Voluntary organizations such as B'nai B'rith are an essential part of a free society. The long history and wide range of B'nai B'rith interests have been a positive and constructive force for a good part of the history of our Nation."

May you continue in your positive and constructive influence, secure in the knowledge of past accomplishment, yet challenged by the rich opportunities which the future so generously bestows.

REMARKS BY EDWARD ROSENBLUM, PAST PRESIDENT, ARGLO LODGE, B'NAI B'RITH; PAST PRESIDENT, DISTRICT GRAND LODGE NO. 5, B'NAI B'RITH; NATIONAL HILLEL COMMISSIONER, B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. Speaker, friends, it is strikingly fitting that we who represent America's oldest, larg-

est and most distinguished Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith, have voted unanimously this year to honor you, Mr. Speaker. You have similarly given not only to America but to citizens of the world a long and distinguished service. I searched thru Webster's dictionary as it defines "statesman." Webster says: "One advanced in the principles or art of government; one actively engaged in conducting the business of government or in shaping its policies; one who exercises political leadership wisely without partisanship, in the general interest." But this we know only partly defines our eminent honoree. Your host of friends and admirers everywhere would add your deep compassion for all humans regardless of faith, color or creed, your striving to uplift the poor, and seeking greater dignity and worth for the individual. We respect your deep moral and spiritual belief and fervor. We applaud your compelling love and affection for children and the aged, and your diligent labors which reach out and benefit all segments of our great American community.

Because of your attributes as a great American, a great leader, a great servant of the American people, and not the least, a great friend, we in Argo Lodge of B'nai B'rith—which means as you know, Mr. Speaker, sons of the covenant—honor you tonight with the highest award it is within our power to give—our statesman of the year award.

It is my pleasure to present to you now a young Massachusetts attorney, formerly associated with one of your distinguished colleagues, Hon. Torbert McDonald, 7th Massachusetts District, Mr. Erwin G. Krasnow, vice president of Argo Lodge, who will now, on behalf of the mass membership of our lodge, make the formal presentation.

REMARKS BY ERWIN G. KRASNOW, VICE PRESIDENT OF ARGLO LODGE, B'NAI B'RITH AND CHAIRMAN OF STATESMAN OF THE YEAR AWARD COMMITTEE

It has been said that the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks only of the next election, whereas a statesman thinks of the next generation.

We are here tonight to pay tribute to a great statesman, Speaker John W. McCormack, a man whose distinguished career in public service is marked by an ability to think and act on behalf of the next generation.

The recipient of the 1967 Statesman of the Year Award ranks as one of the greatest leaders in our national history. Beginning in 1917 when he was elected as a member of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, John McCormack has devoted half a century to public service. Prior to coming to Washington, D. C. as a Congressman in 1928, he enlisted in the United States Army and subsequently served in both Houses of the Massachusetts Legislature.

To give proper recognition at this time to his manifold achievements during 39 years of service in the Congress is as futile as trying to telescope onto a small television screen the dimensions and grandeur of the stars in the universe. Speaker McCormack has been in the forefront of leadership as inspirational architect, master parliamentarian and resolute fighter for the passage of laws to help the underprivileged and oppressed, to strengthen our country's defenses and to preserve basic democratic freedoms.

For example, John McCormack's leadership in the 1930's as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee played a large role in the passage of the early Roosevelt legislation which brought our country out of the deep 1929 depression. Name any landmark measure enacted by the Congress in recent times—be it the Selective Service Act, the secret financing of the vital Manhattan atomic bomb project, the liberal-

ization of our immigration laws, the establishment of our space program, the passage of civil rights legislation—history will show that John McCormack, working diligently behind the scenes, has been largely responsible for these achievements.

We pay tribute tonight to a man who has been honored many times in the past by his fellow man. The leading institutions of higher learning in our nation have acclaimed him for his work in education and for his efforts in other legislative areas directly affecting the well being of children by conferring honorary degrees of Doctor of Law upon the Speaker.

He has been honored by all religious faiths. He holds the Peace Medal of the Order of Catholic Laymen. He has been honored by the Vatican as a Knight of Malta. Several Jewish organizations have paid tribute to the Speaker for his unrelenting support of the democratic State of Israel. Indeed, Argo Lodge presented him with its coveted Americanization Award in 1957.

The people of his district and his home state of Massachusetts have honored him on many occasions. Last year the Commonwealth of Massachusetts officially declared March 16th as John W. McCormack Day. The people of Boston have named a new \$3 million school building in Dorchester in his honor. The John W. McCormack School will provide for the education of more than 1100 pupils each year. Such an honor—the naming of a new public school—has not been previously granted to a public figure during his lifetime.

His colleagues in the Congress have honored John McCormack by unanimously selecting him as Speaker of the House during the 87th through 90th Congresses. The Speaker, a man whose word is his bond, is one of the most loved and respected Members of the House.

He has been honored on many occasions by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, each of whom has looked to Speaker McCormack for advice and counsel. President Johnson has stated that he knows of no person who has been more devoted, who has been more courageous under fire, and who has been more compassionate for his fellow man than our beloved Speaker. The President sent the following telegram to the Lodge and asked that it be read to the Speaker tonight. The telegram reads:

"I was delighted to hear that the Argo Lodge of B'nai B'rith is presenting its 'Statesman of the Year Award' to my good friend, John McCormack. Speaker McCormack's entire public career has reflected his dedication to the democratic principles which your own organization has done so much to uphold. Your award is most fitting—and I deeply appreciate this opportunity to add my own voice to those of the Speaker's many admirers.

"Please convey my warm best wishes to him and to all who are present tonight.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

Speaker McCormack, no single plaque or citation could even begin to describe the outstanding contribution you have made to the nation, the world and mankind. We of Argo Lodge are forced to be content with the following phrases:

"Arglo Lodge, B'nai B'rith salutes Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, United States House of Representatives, as Statesman of the Year for his faithful service to the United States as a dedicated legislator, compassionate humanitarian and courageous fighter for freedom and world peace. Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967."

The officers and members of Argo Lodge wish you many more years of similar outstanding public service.